

Albert Spanagel, Lawrenceburg.  
Henry E. Delp, Marshall.  
Joseph M. Bowen, Mishawaka.  
Hugh G. McMahan, Rochester.  
James E. Purkiser, West Baden Springs.

## IOWA

Mary A. Waters, Delmar.  
Jurgen B. Boldt, Jesup.

## KANSAS

Harold J. March, Bucklin.  
George R. Cleveland, Fort Dodge.  
Kathleen M. Malone, Herndon.  
Ruth Hopson, Phillipsburg.

## MAINE

Joseph M. Mountain, Dexter.  
Henry H. Higgins, Ellsworth.  
Charles A. Robbins, Lincoln.  
Opal F. Temple, Monticello.  
Edith B. Holden, Oakfield.  
Linwood J. Emery, Sanford.

## MONTANA

Carl A. Walker, Musselshell.

## NEBRASKA

David A. Rose, Brunswick.  
Maurice W. Ahern, Carroll.

## NEW YORK

Harry Averill, Adams Center.  
Estell R. Harrington, Alexander.  
Thomas F. Reilly, Bear Mountain.  
Edwin G. Champlin, Cherry Creek.  
John Frank Gagen, Cutchogue.  
Victoria C. Moore, Dryden.  
Bess J. Smith, Hammond.  
Elsa D. Hart, High Falls.  
George E. Blust, Holland Patent.  
Howard R. Stevens, Hopewell Junction.  
Glenn C. Edick, Lacona.  
Theodore W. Cook, Montauk.  
Emily B. Koons, Manlius.  
Carson C. Faulkner, Margaretville.  
Katherine W. Davis, Miller Place.  
John H. Douglass, Orient.  
Mae J. Pessenar, Pine Hill.  
Robert E. Boslet, Syosset.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert A. Deason, Barnwell.  
Helen Van Keuren, Cayce.  
Kirby Melton, Chesterfield.  
Marjorie E. Chumley, Slater.

## WISCONSIN

Jean A. Henning, Altoona.  
Dale Leslie Waller, Boulder Junction.  
Oscar A. Peterson, Granton.  
Mabel A. Dunwiddie, Juda.  
Anna Metz, Little Chute.  
John R. Bernard, Necedah.  
Ethel E. McKnight, Oakfield.  
Maude A. Whalen, Pelican Lake.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RAYBURN).

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

As the Father hath sent me into the world, even so have I sent you. Teach us, O Lord God, that there is a divine purpose in each life. Do Thou send us forth to the pasture lands of truth and feed our souls upon the hilltops of the spiritual; there show us how to wait in holy silence till Thou

hast made Thy will known to us. We pray Thee to inspire us dauntlessly to grasp the higher, the larger, and the completing realities of our Saviour. Amid the clanging discords of men and nations, substitute the Christian unity revealed in our Lord and Master. We thank Thee that Thou art the bread of life, and Thee alone do we seek. We need God manifest in the flesh, God stooping to our lowliness, God strengthening our weakness and lifting us to the high, still places where life is tranquil and sweet and its loveliness is immortal. Through Christ our most merciful Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8641. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, to provide supplemental appropriations for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

## TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—1941

Mr. LUDLOW submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8068) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein radio addresses by Senator WAGNER, of New York, and Senator DOWNEY, of California, and others on the American Forum of the Air.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address made by Archbishop Spellman, of New York, and also an editorial in this morning's New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

There was no objection.

## UNITED STATES CODE CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, there is presently being issued, by the West Publishing Co., a United States Code Congressional Service, which includes all the public acts being passed during this present session and which will later be classified and incorporated into the United States Code. There are also conveniently listed therein Executive orders and proclamations. The editor in chief of that company which is the official editor of the United States Code, working under the supervision and direction of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, has graciously consented to add to the mailing list Members of the House who may desire to receive this current pamphlet service. Those who desire to be placed on the list should communicate with the chairman of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws and we shall be very happy to do the necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a distinguished constituent relative to the census taking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the secretary of the Salinas (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

#### EVERY MAN TO HIS TRADE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Times-Herald quotes the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, as saying:

When Tom Dewey first accepted the role of "clamor boy" for the Republican Party, I remarked that he had tossed his diaper into the ring. As the result of subsequent education in infant's intimate garments, I hereby make a public correction. I shouldn't have said diaper. A diaper has to be pinned up both front and back.

This statement shows how little the proud father of a sometime proud son has learned about pinning on diapers from his recent experience.

As the Secretary by this time should know, if he has—and I assume he has—been performing as a good husband, a diaper should be put on in this manner, if you follow the method used in the "horse and buggy" days:

You first fold the diaper into a triangle in this way; then you spread it smoothly on the bed or crib in this manner; then you place the baby on it, back down, one point of the triangle pointing toward the baby's feet, and laying between its legs. I regret the Secretary is not here so that the instruction might be visual.

Then you take the two points of the diaper, draw them over the baby's hips just below the navel; hold them in your left hand and, with your right hand, pick up in this manner the third point which was down by the baby's knees; draw it up to the other two points and insert your pin—of course, a safety pin—in the diaper, Mr. Secretary, not in the baby—and one pin—not two—is needed.

If you want to do a little fancy pinning and fasten the baby's stockings, then you use two more pins—one over each leg where the diaper, as it comes around the exterior and interior portion of the baby's leg, meets, and there you pin those two edges and the stockings together.

I would not be so explicit, were it not that I hope the Secretary of the Interior will profit by this information. He may even issue a bulletin on it.

I have been told, although I have had no practical experience, that another way is to fold the diaper into a rectangle, pull the lower edge up between the baby's legs and fasten with a pin at the hip on each side.

It is barely possible that Dewey may, before he is through, pin a diaper over the lower part of Secretary Ickes' face and so stop Ickes' picturesque descriptions of other people and their motives.

Perhaps Secretary Ickes should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Agriculture frequently uses a large, wide vehicle, with spikes on a roll on the back end, which, at certain seasons of the year, makes frequent trips between the barnyard and the fields.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech given by Senator BRIDGES in Dallas, Tex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAWKS]?

There was no objection.

#### MANHATTAN-BROOKLYN TUNNEL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I was very much surprised and disappointed to find that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had loaned \$57,000,000 for the purpose of putting a tunnel under the river from Manhattan to Brooklyn in New York City. This will be a toll tunnel, the charge to be 25 to 50 cents. This tunnel is within half a mile of the Brooklyn Bridge, which is free and serves practically the same territory, and three blocks farther away is the Manhattan Bridge, another free bridge. I cannot see how such a project can possibly pay out. I do not believe the Reconstruction Finance Corporation ought to loan that amount of money in that kind of a situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial concerning the Wheeler-Lea railroad bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OF CODE OF LAWS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RELATING TO MURDER IN THE FIRST DEGREE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 186) to amend section 798 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia relating to murder in the first degree, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. NICHOLS, EBERHARTER, and DIRKSEN.

There was no objection.

#### NEW CODE OF LAWS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8891) authorizing the appointment of a commission to prepare a new Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker on roll call No. 42 and roll call No. 43 I was absent from the Chamber due to a slight illness. I should like to say that had I been present, on the first roll call, I would have voted "nay," and, on the second roll call, I would have voted "yea."



## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE on a Nation-wide radio hook-up last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

## MONEY

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to call the attention of the House to an extension of my remarks appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD, page 1393, on the subject of money. This address is simply the chapter on that subject taken from my book Prosperity Through Employment. I have received many letters from persons all over the country asking me either to print a small book on that subject or give it greater publicity than the sale of the book has done. Among others, Senator Robert L. Owen has for a long time insisted on my doing this, giving it as his opinion that this chapter is the best short statement on this subject ever written. A fair understanding of the subject of money is of primary importance at the present time. It lies at the foundation of recovery. I therefore asked and received the consent of the House to place it in the RECORD, and I respectfully commend it to the attention of my colleagues. I intend shortly to submit a statement on inflation and deflation, to which I shall call attention at that time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain editorials on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep-waterway project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## MOVING PICTURE ON THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, in 1939 the United States New York World's Fair Commission, in its Federal Building, showed a moving picture, The History of the United States. We intend to show this picture in 1940 for the Members of the House and the Senate. We have extended an invitation to attend the showing of this picture tomorrow evening at the departmental auditorium, on Constitution Avenue between Twelfth and Fourteenth Streets. We trust that all the Members of the House and the Senate will come and bring their wives and see this great picture. It truly is a masterpiece. It was produced at no cost whatever to the World's Fair Commission.

[Here the gavel fell.]

## LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. RABAUT, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 8913) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1764), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. RICH reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8913)

making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate run along today until we make a decision as to the termination of the debate, the time to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8913, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question before he begins his statement?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Last year there was considerable agitation as to whether or not the House Chamber was safe, and a special engineering appropriation was provided to investigate that question. I did not notice anything in the report about the matter and I am wondering if the gentleman is now prepared to give us any information along that particular line.

Mr. RABAUT. I would say to my friend from New York that I have not the data with me here, but there has been an investigation made by the Bureau of Docks, by the Bureau of Standards, and by the Architect of the Capitol, and by some consulting engineers. A committee has been appointed consisting of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and myself, and we thought a little further data on the subject ought to be obtained before submitting something on the matter later this year. It has been impossible to do anything on the roof in the time that has elapsed since the matter was first brought to the attention of Congress because of the fact we had a special session last fall. If anything is to be done about it, the information will be given to the committee sometime between now and the close of the present session.

Mr. Chairman, this is a small appropriation bill as appropriation bills go, but it is the most important bill in the whole category, because it contains provision for all of the tools by which Members are able to perform their legislative duties, to say nothing of the pay and mileage and stationery.

The subcommittee which considers this bill always has a number of particular problems. Everything covered in this bill is close at hand. For many of these things there are 435 managers in the House and 96 in the Senate, which makes it difficult at some times but pleasant most of the time. I want to extend my thanks to the members of the subcommittee who served with me, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. McANDREWS, Mr. RICH, and Mr. STEFAN, who acted for our colleague, Mr. POWERS, who was engaged in the military hearings. We missed the gentleman from New Jersey, but in Mr. STEFAN we had a capable "pinch hitter" who takes a live interest in all legislative matters and gave us the benefit of his experience and advice. This is the first time the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has been able to sit with the subcommittee, because he has been engaged on other subcommittees. I want to say for him that he cooperated in every way in helping us to write a good bill, and even though he asked every important witness before the committee where the money was coming from, I think he still is seeking an answer. He helped us make these good cuts and I hope he will help us sustain them here. The gentleman is an industrious and conscientious public servant and it was a pleasure to work with him. Need I say anything about the loyal and friendly qualities of JIM McANDREWS and "JO" FERNANDEZ? You know their lovable and capable characteristics as well as I do. So you need not wonder why I am proud to be the subchairman of such a group.

In the total expenditures estimated for next fiscal year, 1941—in excess of \$8,000,000,000—this bill of around \$24,000,000 represents about three-tenths of 1 percent for the legislative branch.

In framing the bill the committee has been actuated by the purposes which have governed the action of the committee at this session to cut wherever possible without injury to the public service. This is largely a maintenance bill with many salaries and expenses that we cannot get along without. It contains very little of new construction, except such as may come under the Architect of the Capitol, so that opportunities to make cuts are somewhat limited.

The Budget estimates which were considered were \$25,785,612; the committee has cut these by \$1,877,868; this is a decrease of 7.2 percent.

Comparing this cut with a range of from 3 to 10 percent in the estimates on other bills, the committee feels that it has done a good job.

The bill carries a total of \$23,907,744.

It is \$626,301 over the 1940 appropriations and I will discuss this figure later.

I want to tell you first where we cut the total of \$1,877,868 from the estimates.

We cut \$158,000 off the item for the repair of the Capitol terraces, and I will also discuss that a little later.

We eliminated \$390,000 for paving the plaza and roadways of the Capitol Grounds. This is an item that we cannot much longer put off, but in view of the terrace and roof work and the heavy hauling involved we felt it ought to wait until they were over.

We cut \$73,000 from the Senate Office Building estimates, as that is Senate business and we left that for them.

We cut \$108,000 from the estimate for elevator replacement in the old office building. By allowing \$6,000 for new doors and other devices for these elevators they will be in good condition for a few years and are not so urgent at this time.

We cut \$167,000 from the Capitol power plant, denying an item for installation of an ash eliminator and some other improvements that are not essential now.

We eliminated \$100,750 in improvements in the old Library Building, including the following: \$30,000 for renewal of pneumatic tube system, \$10,000 for a sprinkler system for the grounds, \$55,750 for cleaning the exterior, and \$5,000 for a study of air conditioning.

We eliminated \$64,000 for furniture, equipment, and cases for the Library buildings.

We eliminated \$90,000 for new greenhouses for the Botanic Garden Nursery at Poplar Point and the removal of some old greenhouses down here near the conservatory. By spending \$1,500 these old houses can be made to last a year or two more.

We eliminated \$730,730 from Library of Congress estimates, which I will also discuss later.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement, and my attention was challenged by the statement of the gentleman about the entire cost of the House of Representatives being three-tenths percent. The gentleman did not make a complete comparison, but I thought the gentleman had in mind a comparison with other Government expenditures or the total expenditures of the Government.

Mr. RABAUT. I stated that the total estimated cost of running the entire Government this next fiscal year is about \$8,000,000,000, and the cost of the legislative branch is about three-tenths percent of that amount.

Mr. DONDERO. That is, as compared with the total Government expenditures?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

I now come to the increase of \$626,301 over 1940. We had to make provision for some items in this bill about which we had no discretion and which required substantial increases

over 1940. These items which I am about to give are the main increases over 1940:

Increase in Senators' clerk hire, on a 12-month basis in 1941, instead of 6 months for 1940.....	\$179,400
Increase in Members' clerk hire for the same reason.....	328,500
Increase in telegraph for the House, due to increase in rates by the Federal Communications Commission.....	30,000
Repair of the terraces of the Capitol.....	350,000
Paving of the parking lot near the new House Office Building for use of Members and employees.....	27,849
Improvements in the old House Office Building to provide storage space and elevator repairs.....	40,000
New cases, stacks, and equipment for the Library Building.....	78,299
Increase for the Library of Congress.....	340,791
Increase for the Government Printing Office.....	180,000

These main increases amount to..... 1,554,839

They are offset by nonrecurring items totaling around \$900,000, leaving a net increase amounting to a little over \$600,000.

The two increases for Senators' and Members' clerk hire are automatic. The new act went into effect January 1, 1940, providing for these extra clerks, and the appropriations for 1940, therefore, only had to cover 6 months of this fiscal year. We must provide in this bill for the entire fiscal year 1941, which accounts for the increase of a little over \$500,000.

The Federal Communications Commission has increased the Government rate for domestic messages, effective January 1, 1940. Heretofore the rate for the Government has been 40 percent of the commercial rate, and that has been raised to 60 percent. They have the authority to make this change, and we must pay the increased cost.

The repair of the terraces of the main Capitol Building has given the committee a great deal of concern. The estimate was \$508,000, which included the provision of a number of office rooms and cutting windows in the exterior of the terrace walls. We have eliminated this feature and confined the item strictly to a repair and reconstruction job. It is an item that has been deferred several times, and we feel, and the Architect of the Capitol feels, that it should not be further put off. The terraces constitute the one-story structure that surrounds the north, west, and south sides of the building. The roof forms a walkway or plaza above the space underneath which houses a few offices, shops, equipment, document storage, and other utilities for the main building. The terraces have an over-all length of 1,460 feet, average 60 feet wide, and comprise a square-foot area of more than 2 acres. They are supported by brick columns, on which rest iron beams supporting a waterproof membrane—or what was waterproof—covered with a 5-inch unreinforced concrete slab. There are some 70 skylights in this walk area, and the plaza is entirely surrounded by a stone balustrade. The waterproofing membrane beneath the concrete is gone and the concrete is sagging and cracked, and the area leaks badly in many places. The vast expanse of concrete, stone, and iron is subject to considerable expansion and contraction due to the exposure of the sun's heat in midsummer, and in many places the balustrade is out of line and at one spot more than 3 inches. There are over 80 breaks in this balustrade, of varying degrees in width, due to this settling and expanding and contracting. After a careful study of the problem, the only solution seems to be to take off the paving and membrane down to the iron supports. There has been so much leakage that there is some uncertainty as to just what condition those beams may be in. They may in some places be badly corroded. It is proposed to replace the membrane with a suitable up-to-date waterproofing material and to lay 3-inch marble blocks on sand and install flashing. All skylights which now are so productive of leaks will be eliminated. No changes are contemplated in architectural design. The only purpose is repair, and the characteristics of this part of this historic building will not be altered.

There are a number of urgent and expensive improvements waiting to be made on the Hill—the roofs for the Senate



and House wings, the repaving of the plaza and roadways, and this item.

We feel that the terraces and the roof item should precede the paving as there will be much heavy hauling for the roofs and the terraces and the old paving should endure that load and incidental damage.

The parking lot near the new House Office Building belongs to the Government and is used by Members and their clerks. It is now covered with coarse cinders, is rough, poorly arranged, and not properly drained. It is also dusty and not satisfactory for the purpose. The amount allowed of \$27,849 will place the lot in suitable condition with a 3-inch bituminous paving over the area, proper concrete bumpers, drainage, and so forth. It will accommodate 277 cars.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HILL. Have the gentleman and his committee had an opportunity to investigate the conditions in the schoolrooms for the pages? It seems to me we could use some money there to provide better lights and better conditions generally.

Mr. RABAUT. Under this item for repair of the terrace, those rooms will be taken care of and some additional space will be given to the pages' schoolrooms, so they will not be so crowded.

Mr. HILL. I am glad of that.

Mr. RABAUT. I was down there and personally investigated the matter, I will say to the gentleman.

The improvements in the old House Office Building contemplate alterations in the attic to provide 192 storage rooms for Members in that building similar to the storage rooms provided for Members in the new building and to remove a fire hazard that now exists in that space; this will cost \$20,000. Another \$20,000 will replace the present freight elevator in the southeast corner of the building, which has been there since the building was constructed and has reached the end of its usefulness and safety; this will cost \$14,000 of the \$20,000. The other \$6,000 is to improve the safety devices on two inside elevators on the northwest corner of the old building by putting in modern doors and locking devices so as to make them more safe. These installations can be made use of when these elevators are replaced. They are old elevators, but are in fair condition, due to their limited use.

We have provided some new metal map cases, new stacks, and other equipment for the Library of Congress properly to house and care for the constantly increasing quantity of books and other material. Some of this is to replace wooden cases that constitute fire hazards and are cumbersome and space occupying compared with the new steel cases.

Part of this equipment is to house the storage of catalog cards which are sold by the Library and constitute a profitable business, the revenues amounting to over \$300,000 a year. The law division also needs some new stacks to accommodate its growth, and provision is being made for stacks and cases to accommodate some 30,000 volumes of reference books and 40,000 volumes of rare books, 99 percent of which are out of print.

The \$180,000 for the Government Printing Office includes \$45,000 for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents to cover additional employees and supplies and catalogs to handle the increasing sales and distribution of Government publications. Receipts from sales of Government publications now amount to close to \$1,000,000 a year, and every effort is being made by the Public Printer to stimulate this phase of distribution of publications.

I now come to the item which gave the committee more concern and difficulty than any other. I refer to the Library of Congress. The Budget estimates from the Library presented an increase of \$1,070,000 and called for 287 new positions.

I want to go back a little and give you a historical background of the institution. Dr. Putnam had been Librarian for

40 years. During the past decade the Library had become very congested due to the constant increase in books and other library material, and there was neither space to house the material properly nor to accommodate employees properly to catalog, classify, and sort it. When the new annex was opened Dr. Putnam submitted his estimates to care for this material and go to work on the arrearages that had accumulated due to the inadequacies of space in the old building. He asked for 200 new positions and about \$700,000 increase in money. He was about to retire and a new Librarian was to come in. The committee felt it was only fair, if there was to be a change in administration over there, that the new man should have a chance to look over the plant and personnel and conditions generally and formulate his own policies and conclusions. So Dr. Putnam's increase was eliminated, with a few exceptions, to await the new Librarian's conclusions.

Mr. MacLeish was appointed on October 1, 1939, just 15 days before the estimates for the Library for the fiscal year 1941 were due in the Bureau of the Budget, according to law. He consulted with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. TAYLOR, and wrote me asking that he might be permitted to have more time. Consequently he submitted in the regular Budget the regular estimates in the amount of the 1940 appropriations and then went to work to find out about the Library so he could send in his conclusions in a supplemental estimate when Congress met. He had 3 months to do this.

Mr. MacLeish made a most favorable impression upon the committee by the way he has attacked the problem over there. He has worked prodigiously, going into every phase of the Library work. He has had experts from a number of the outstanding libraries in the country study the institution and advise with him. He has had the help of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office in revamping the accounting system and the collection of moneys from various work they perform. He has, to my way of thinking—and I have visited the place quite a number of times—instilled a new spirit in the organization and wants to make the Library really serviceable.

The committee has had the best hearings on the Library this year that it has ever had. We spent 2 days going through the estimates with the Librarian and his aides. We have been over there ourselves.

We feel that something constructive and substantial needs to be done. We did not accede, however, to all of the approach which the Librarian suggested.

He asked for 287 new positions totaling \$535,056.

We gave him 130 new positions totaling \$211,296.

Of these 130, 10 are now on the roll costing \$21,580; 13 are for the building maintenance costing \$6,936; and eliminating these there are 107 new people for library work at a total salary of \$182,760.

He asked for an increase in the book-purchase fund in the sum of \$275,000.

We gave none of that.

He asked for an increase in the lawbook purchase fund in the sum of \$15,000.

We gave none of that.

He asked for increase in pay within grades \$108,720.

We did not allow that.

He asked for a total increase of \$1,071,521.

We cut this by the sum of \$730,730.

We gave a total increase of \$340,791.

In applying this increase we did so on this basis. The processing of books—that is, cataloging, classifying, and so forth, getting them ready for the shelves—is greatly in arrears and has been for many years. It is getting so bad that the cost of bringing up the arrearage may be more than we want to tackle. The Library takes in some 200,000 new books every year, and yet it has only been able to process about 160,000 to 170,000 of these, the rest accumulating uncataloged. That has been getting progressively worse. To stop this arrearage, just to keep even, the Library asked for 82 people,

and we gave 50. We also gave in the other divisions of the Library which have to do with taking in other classes of material—and where 101 were asked—a total of 38 people, and of these there are 8 now on the roll, making a net of 30. In the administrative end of the Library he asked for 16 people, including 2 Assistant Librarians at \$6,500 each, an information service, and other help, and we have allowed 7. We eliminated the 2 Assistant Librarians and gave 1 administrative assistant at \$5,600 to take charge of this processing work and coordinate the work of cataloging, classifying, labeling, and so forth, to speed up that end of the job and coordinate and bring some order out of the chaos.

For the copyright office and the card index division, both revenue producers, revenues in 1941 estimated at a total of \$640,000, we allowed some increases in personnel. The legislative reference asked 32 new positions and \$78,420, and we allowed none of it.

In the binding fund we allowed an increase of \$100,000. Many thousands of volumes are falling to pieces on the shelves for want of rebinding. There is a backlog of \$1,350,000 in binding, and it is progressively getting worse. The committee felt that instead of buying new books and increasing the collections, we had better first preserve what we had, so we cut out the increase of \$305,000 for book purchases and allowed this binding increase. There are 215,000 volumes that badly need rebinding. There are over 300,000 volumes that are ready to bind and cannot be touched for lack of funds. We feel that we can make a good start with this increase from \$300,000 to \$400,000.

The Librarian asked for a sizable increase in the reading room, 11 higher-priced places to add to the scholarly services of the Library, as he puts it, "mediate between the books and the reader." He also asked for a considerable of a research force in the legislative reference to act as expert advisers to Congress in matters of legislation. We did not allow any of this. We do not disparage the effort. It came from a desire to be serviceable and it has a place in Library service, but we felt that it was more important to handle, make available, and preserve what we have now in the Library, and what is coming in, than it is to add scholarly services and more books and go further in arrears with what we have.

Now I want to speak about the salary situation in the Library. Increases were urged by the Librarian in the sum of \$108,720 for promotions for 901 out of the 1,200 employees. His program called for one step advance in the grade for all employees above \$2,000 and enough steps for those below to bring them all to the average of the grade. We have followed the committee's rule with reference to departments and eliminated the entire amount.

In doing this, we have, however, made some leeway for the Library to make some promotions. We have indicated in the report that the lapse money that will be available can be used on the basis of the committee formula. Heretofore the Library has used lapse money to provide badly needed additional personnel to try to get ahead with this accumulated work. The new Librarian was very frank and honest about this. He thinks it is wrong to use lapse money to hire additional personnel and in making that statement he earned a warm approval from the committee. So we have put the personnel now paid from lapses on regular appropriations. This will free that amount, running in excess of \$20,000, to be used for advances within grades in accord with the formula. The new positions we have placed in here, after eliminating the charwomen and the 10 now on the roll, amount to 107. There will be a byproduct in promotions as a result of the new positions in the shape of line promotions when they utilize their own people to fill the new jobs. The lapse money and the line promotions will help the salary situation very materially.

We have put a limitation in the bill on the amount that can be used by legislative reference for the digest of general public bills. They had about \$25,000 in the estimates and we cut it to \$20,000. I sent out a circular letter to all the Members of the House asking their opinion about this digest of bills. I got 134 responses out of 435 Members; 36 were either indifferent or opposed and 98 were favorable. Based on this

cross section of 30 percent of the membership we concluded that the Members wanted it continued in some form. We have curtailed it and suggested that they eliminate the expensive printing of monthly editions and try to get along on mimeographed weekly copies.

We have also indicated in the report that the legislative reference should not renew the mimeographed daily edition of the digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The cost would run about \$700 a session on the basis it was started but it would not be long before they would have more orders than they could handle. It was criticized on the floor by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and they stopped it temporarily. We indicate in the report that it should not be started again.

I want to say a word in general about the increase that is carried for the Library. It is substantial but it needs to be. This is a great National Library. It has the finest buildings and the largest collections of any library in the world. In point of its collections it is one of the two or three finest in the world. All Americans are proud of it. It is not up to date in dealing with the material that is constantly coming in. I think the committee has faith in Mr. MacLeish as an administrator and as a cultured and scholarly man who is taking a pride in endeavoring to get this institution up to a level that we want to see. We have gone only part way with him in his program. We have gone about one-third in money and about 40 percent in personnel. What we have done is directed toward getting up to date with what we have. We can talk in the future about expansion of service to the readers, research, scholarly direction, and other utilities of the Library. For the present we must be concerned with getting rid of arrearages and making the plant function on what we have. We have money limitations this year that are an important factor. The report on the bill dealing with the Library is pretty full. I hope you will read it and I hope you will read the hearings. We have gone fully into these matters and feel that we have acted fairly and constructively by the Library and fairly by the Treasury.

There are many minor matters in connection with the bill that I could call your attention to. They are fully set forth in the report and I shall be glad to answer any questions you may have about them.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a remark?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to make public acknowledgment of an error of judgment. I opposed the confirmation of Mr. MacLeish as Librarian of the Library of Congress on the ground I thought we should have a man trained in library work. I wish now to acknowledge publicly, and as publicly as I protested his confirmation, that I made a mistake, for I think for the first time in the history of that Library or since I have known anything about it, and that is since 1909, it is now being made of some use, benefit, and service to the Members of Congress as a Library of the Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I wonder if every Member of the House is aware that we have a legislative service committee in the Congressional Library that serves the Members of Congress in research work?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. It is a very valuable committee and has been of service to me personally and to other Members who know about it.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. To ask about the estimates that were given to the committee by the predecessor of the present Librarian. They were refused, the gentleman says, because a new Librarian was coming in. Did the new Librarian rec-



commend more or less than the amount recommended by the old Librarian?

Mr. RABAUT. He recommended more.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman speaks about the cooperation of others. I would like to have it of record that the present Librarian did have the hearty cooperation and assistance and even sympathy of the retiring Librarian.

Mr. RABAUT. Oh, very much so. The Librarian Emeritus is over there today. I did not mean to infer anything to the contrary, and I am very glad the gentleman has called it to my attention.

Mr. GIFFORD. The figures of Mr. Putnam were exceeded by those of the new Librarian?

Mr. RABAUT. Dr. Putnam's figures were less. His figure was \$700,000, and those of the new man \$1,070,000. The number of positions was less, but the number of positions that we allowed is less than those asked for by Dr. Putnam.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am in a position to hear a good deal about this, and I wanted the Record to show the splendid cooperation given to the present Librarian by the retiring Librarian.

Mr. RABAUT. There is no question about that. The committee feels very friendly to the Librarian Emeritus as well as to the present Librarian. At the time that the former Librarian asked for these increases we explained to him and he understood it very well and there was an agreement upon it. He thought also the positions should not be frozen for the new man. I thought also it was proper in defense of the people who are in the Library at the present time, who were all friends of the former Librarian, because he had been there for 40 years, and I thought those people ought to be secured in their positions there, as they were especially acquainted with the work, and that is the reason that we arrived at that point. But, if all positions were frozen—and there is no civil service in the Library as the gentleman knows—you could not tell what might happen there in the general shake-up of the Library. The money that we are allowing over there for the new positions is principally for the working processes of the Library proper. No allowance is being made at the present time toward what you might call the scholarly end of the Library; that is, for deeper study. The only thing being allowed is to try to get what we have up to date. There are books and other material spread all over the place at the present time, not cataloged or classified. We are running behind on new books to the tune of 40,000 volumes a year and that cannot keep going on forever.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, in these days of war and rumors of more war, and of treaties of peace, it is a long look back, but we should not forget that 165 years ago today, on March 13, 1775, the first blood was shed in the American Revolution at Westminster, Vt.

The affray at the courthouse in Westminster resulting in the shooting and killing of William French and Daniel Houghton, antedated and preceded Lexington and Concord by a month.

Those of you who have read the Green Mountain Boys, and The Rangers are familiar with the historical background. While from the standpoint of historical accuracy, perhaps, it may not properly be called the first battle or engagement in the Revolutionary War, it was nevertheless the first bloodshed, and important because of the temper it displayed and the resentment it aroused. It was an armed resistance to unlawful usurpation, regimentation, and domination, resented by every Green Mountain boy always and everywhere its head is shown.

It is also worthy of note and to be remembered that at a convention held at this same Westminster, on January 15, 1777, Vermont declared itself a free and independent State. Which, may I add, it has continued and always will continue to be, so long as a drop of the blood of those who fought at Westminster, Ticonderoga, Valley Forge, and elsewhere, and

always, for freedom and liberty is traceable in the veins of those generations that have succeeded them.

Incidentally, some of you may not recall that for 14 years Vermont existed as an independent Republic, asking no odds of anyone and giving none.

From the Vermont of Today, With Its Historic Background, Attractions, and People, volume I, chapter VI, I quote the following statement with respect to the Westminster massacre:

An event occurred in the early spring of 1775 that marked the climax of the trouble with New York, and was so near to the Revolutionary War that it is very properly considered the first blood to be shed in the struggle for independence. This was the Westminster massacre, "an occurrence which unified the sentiment of the grants, intensified their opposition to New York, and roused resentment against England, under the cover of whose authority New York was acting." Three conventions had been held at the Westminster Courthouse, in Cumberland County, where the King's court was held in the jurisdiction of what is now Windsor and Windham Counties. The officers were holding their appointments from the Governor of New York, but were really officers of the crown. A regular session of the court was scheduled for March 14, and the Vermonters proposed to show their hostility to the crown by preventing the opening of the court. Before the day arrived they met the presiding judge at Chester and urged him to call off the session. Judge Chandler seemed to feel this ought to be done, but told the delegation that a criminal case required that the court should hold its regular session. Finding all efforts unavailing, a party of Whigs armed themselves from Capt. Azariah Wright's woodpile and took possession of the courthouse. The sheriff and his posse demanded entrance, with the accompanied threat that if they were not admitted in 15 minutes "he would blow a lane through them." The clerk of the court backed up the sheriff and, exhibiting his pistol, swore that "only by it would he hold parley with such damned rascals." Here Judge Chandler intervened, and when the sheriff's party had gone for refreshments, told the Vermonters they could stay in the courthouse until morning, when court would be held and the officers would come in without arms. "With courage reinforced by quotations of flip and fiery rum," the sheriff and his posse returned to the building late in the evening, forced an entrance, and in the melee which followed William French was almost instantly killed, Daniel Houghton was fatally wounded, and several other Vermonters hurt. Court met in the morning, adjourned to the afternoon, and never met again. "The King had departed forever from Westminster," said the late Judge Frank L. Fish at the sesquicentennial celebration in that town January 15, 1927, and the first blood of the American Revolution had been shed.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I noticed that the gentleman had a sort of chuckle and a roguish eye when he looked at me. I merely wish to say to him that he is very welcome to all of the crumbs of history that he can take away from us, because we have so much of it in Massachusetts.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Oh, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, about a year ago a bill was put through the House of Representatives and the Senate at the request of Mr. Roosevelt establishing what is known as the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library at Hyde Park. We all know that that gentleman is always true to his instincts, and that he believes in operating the ward-politician principle to the limit. However, when it comes to the President of the United States getting down to the point he arrived on January 25, 1940, when he issued an Executive order which I am about to read to you, it is going pretty strong. Here it is:

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by the provisions of paragraph 8 of subdivision 2 of section 2 of the Civil Service Act (22 Stat. 403-404), it is hereby ordered that the initial appointments to such professional and subprofessional positions in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, established by public resolution of July 18, 1939 (53 Stat. 1062), as are necessary for the transaction of its affairs, may be effected by the Archivist of the United States without regard to the requirements of the Civil Service Act and rules.

(Signed) FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1940.

Now, they are going to take care of the faithful up around Hyde Park, all the neighbors and the neighbors' boys and girls, so that, instead of a civil-service set-up, we will have a political set-up in that library. He is virtually doing a good job of catering to the ward politicians, but the gentleman does not stop there. Shortly after that there came out certain

statements in the papers. I have before me the Washington Post of February 23, 1940, and right in the middle of the front page it reads:

**ROOSEVELT FIRM INSURES LINE AIDED BY UNITED STATES**

The insurance firm of Roosevelt & Sargent, Inc., in which James Roosevelt is a member and the President's wife a director, has taken over the insurance account of the American President Steamship Line, it was announced yesterday. The chairman of the line, which formerly was known as the Dollar Steamship Lines, is William Gibbs McAdoo, former Senator from California, and political ally of President Roosevelt. John A. Sargent, president and treasurer of the insurance firm, announced the new account, according to an Associated Press dispatch from Boston. McAdoo was named to the \$25,000-a-year position with the President Line after his defeat in the Democratic primaries in 1938. The United States Government holds 90 percent of the common stock of this line. A \$45,000,000 R. F. C. loan was granted the line in 1938, and the Maritime Commission agreed to give the company an annual operating subsidy of \$3,000,000 for a 5-year period. The line's insurance account previously was held by a San Francisco firm. Mrs. Roosevelt became a director of Roosevelt & Sargent December 14, 1938, after her son resigned to accept a position in Hollywood as vice president of Samuel Goldwyn, Inc.

Now, we not only take care of the ward politicians of Hyde Park but we take care of the family. Oh, nicely. Almost from the very beginning there has been inaugurated by this administration a spending program. We start up in the northeastern corner of the country with Passamaquoddy and we go ahead with that until its failure has demonstrated that it should not be done.

We jump down to Florida, and we start the Florida Canal, and we go ahead and build bridges across imaginary canals and spend millions of dollars doing it. Then we jump up to the T. V. A., and we obligate ourselves to spend \$500,000,000 in the southern and central part of the country, and we sell electricity there as low as 1.69 mills to householders, when it has been demonstrated by the Reclamation Service by experience that 2.25 mills is the lowest at which electricity can be sold at the spigot, and we call that a yardstick, obligating the taxpayers of the United States to pay for the electricity that is furnished to the people in the Tennessee Valley, and they tell us it is a yardstick, and they tax the people whom they ridicule, because they claim they are paying too much for electricity, for the difference between the cost of the electricity and what they sell it for. That is a grand yardstick as long as you can get away with it. But sometime the people of the United States are going to wake up to that racket.

Then we jump around all over the country, and we spend billions and billions of dollars upon projects which do not have any justification, designed to follow up the ward-politician idea that by handing the people something with borrowed money, you can subsidize them to the point where you can control their votes.

Personally, I think that the people of the United States are waking up to the idea of what has been done to them, the building up of their national debt from something like \$22,500,000,000 to \$42,395,000,000 of direct debt, and the prospect of a great deal more. The debt that is advertised in the daily Treasury statement does not include all the debt, because there are silver certificates secured by only 35 cents an ounce silver in the Treasury, and the deficiency between the value of that silver at the present time, the market price, and those silver certificates, is \$1,300,000,000, which is a debt that must be added. Then there are \$1,600,000,000 of guaranteed bonds under the United States housing operation.

Then there are four or five or six billion dollars net of liabilities for guaranteed bonds of different corporations.

Oh, we have had a great step forward in progress in the last 7 years, a step forward in the direction of bankruptcy, absolutely preventing economic recovery and the employment of our people; absolutely preventing the farmer of the United States and the workingman from getting enough out of their operations to make a decent living.

Is it not time that we stopped this ward-politician idea of handing the Government of the United States and establish a sound, businesslike principle in handling our fiscal affairs? Is it not time that we stopped fooling away the people's money

on things that we do not have any justification for? Is it not time that we gave proper consideration to those things that are being done to us?

Let me say to you that when we come to the point where our people's elections can be controlled by the spending of money, the liberties of the American people are gone. It is a step toward the formation of a dictatorship that cannot be denied. It is a step toward the destruction of the American Constitution and a step toward the establishment in this country of a dictatorship that will completely upset and destroy the fundamental liberties of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Is it not time for us to wake up and get rid of this continual cry of "Emergency"; stop being deceived by measures which do not promote economic and business recovery? Look out for the liberties of the American people, and give the farmer and the workingman of America a chance; give the taxpayer a chance, and set our eyes forward and stop this reactionary, destructive method of handling the Government of the United States. Let not anybody be fooled into the idea that the kind of operation we have been through is progressive. That word has long been used as a cloak to cover up many sins, but never so notorious and so vicious as in the last 7 years. I am hoping that patriotism and a sense of responsibility will come again to the people of the United States, and that they will stop this raid upon their liberties. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman deals with problems of immigration, naturalization, and deportation. The committee has been working earnestly during these times of chaos and unrest in this country to determine something about the factors affecting immigration, naturalization, and deportation.

There seems to have been some discrimination against the committee for no reason whatsoever. I notice that the last few times whenever private bills were called on the Private Calendar most of the bills were objected to even though the committee had reported them out unanimously, Republicans and Democrats joining in the favorable report. I venture to say that if the objectors were asked to tell us the merits or demerits of a bill they objected to they could not have done so. It seems that most of the objections are based on the ground that somebody does not like somebody else, or does not like somebody's name, so objection is made.

Let me assure you that politics are not involved in the consideration of bills by this committee made up of 22 conscientious Members drawn from both sides of the aisle. We are trying to do an honest job and do it for the best interest of the country. About a year ago the committee felt there was entirely too much smuggling of aliens into this country and we desired to know something about it. We also wanted to know something about the rules and regulations with a view to seeing whether a uniform policy of administration of the law could not be worked out, and the committee at that time went on record unanimously, Republicans and Democrats joining, asking the Committee on Rules for a rule authorizing the Committee on Immigration to study the whole question of immigration and the problem of the border patrol. In this connection let me call attention to the fact that although we have more than 9,000 miles of border, only approximately 240 officers protect this vast extended area on the Mexican and Canadian sides. In other words, if we lined up our enforcement officers to cover the border they would be about 5 miles apart.

One of the problems which bothered us was the fact that within the last few years a considerable group of Chinamen came into the United States over the Mexican border. How they came across we did not know, but we had an idea we could find out who was operating this smuggling ring in this country. So we asked the Rules Committee for a rule to make this investigation because we knew of certain circumstances that we thought, if developed, could throw a



great deal of light on the whole question. After presenting our evidence before the distinguished Rules Committee, they voted the rule out unanimously, but on that very day some question touching a milk investigation occupied the attention of the House and this rule could not be reached. The rule was not brought up again. About 2 weeks thereafter the Rules Committee took up further consideration of this resolution for which we had asked, and when we got before the committee they told us they did not like some of the language in the resolution and objected to certain powers the committee asked for. I went back to the committee and laid the situation before them. By a unanimous vote we corrected the resolution to make it conform with the suggestions of the Rules Committee. The resolution came before the committee again and they wanted other changes. We complied again. The resolution came before the committee again only a few weeks ago, but I am reliably informed they are not going to vote out a rule on it. Why? Because some people in this Capitol talk about enforcement but do not want enforcement, some people talk about the evils of immigration and make a lot of capital out of it, but they do not really want enforcement of the immigration laws. Why? I have in some way discovered that over a number of years bad practices have arisen; for instance, during seasonal employment of farm hands in the West they bring in a lot of peon cheap labor. Instead of giving this employment to people in this country at American wages, they bring in these peons from Mexico at 15 cents or 20 cents a day to go out in the fields and do this work. After the seasonal employment has ended we then have a difficult job on our hands to get these people out of the country again. Our committee would like to stop it. We would like to stop all abuses of our borders. We would like to see more men patrolling the border, both the Canadian border and the Mexican border.

But apparently the Rules Committee does not agree with us. That committee does not seem to want to stop smuggling and all of these other things that we charged before it. I believe this statement applies to Members on both sides of the aisle, on the majority and minority sides, because the last time I appeared before the committee one of the minority members stated he did not think an investigation was needed. He stated further that we ought to enforce the existing laws. But you cannot enforce the laws with a group of racketeers practicing smuggling through what seems to be strongly organized syndicates. So to my great astonishment and surprise this resolution is not going to be reported out of that committee. I want to state here that the committee in charge of this kind of legislation should not be held responsible then for present conditions. The Committee on Immigration has done its duty in trying to determine just exactly what laws to present to the Congress, but we cannot pass any laws at this time without getting at the cause. The cost of the investigation would not be more than \$10,000. I know other committees in this House have been given hundreds of thousands of dollars for more or less important considerations than the question before us now of cleaning our borders and cleaning our country of undesirable aliens.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I am unable to come to a conclusion at once with regard to some of the matters the gentleman has presented to the Members and I want to give it more thought; but may I add that there have been in recent years many aliens flocking across the international line into the State of Arizona, so I am reliably informed, which is creating a distinct problem? I have it from the civil officers and patriotic organizations along the border that this is occurring now. They are urging that we do not lessen our vigilance but rather increase it, to see that the border is properly protected, because it is our back door.

I recognize one thing that the gentleman mentioned. There have been times some years ago to my knowledge when we deliberately let down the bars to permit laborers from Mexico to come in, but I think that will never be done again. We had a rather sad experience with that sort of

thing a dozen or so years ago. May I say now that we have plenty of unemployed in that part of the country today to do all the agricultural work which it is necessary to do. These new farm laborers have not come from a foreign land; they have come from another part of my own country into Arizona.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I add that we have the front door of our country closed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, we have closed the front door. We are careful with reference to who comes into this country. They have to establish that they will not become a public charge, they have to be persons not excluded under our immigration laws, they have to have some family ties; but the back door is open. Some people do not want to close the back door. These are the people who talk most about the immigration problem.

May I say in this connection also that I have before me about 70 or 80 so-called alien-baiting bills, bills covering the subject from soup to nuts. If you will read some of them and would use them, you could make up a good vaudeville show. Some want to tax the aliens who live here. Some want to fingerprint them. Some want to have them report to police stations in case they remove a tooth and advise the police all about the procedure. But there is not one bill before the committee to clear up the question of the border, and I submit that the Committee on Immigration is not responsible for the condition that exists today, as indicated by my colleague the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated that the front door is closed but that the back door is open. If the front door is closed, it indicates that we have laws on the statute books today to deal with the immigrant situation?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. At the front door.

Mr. KEEFE. At the front door?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. It is the gentleman's contention, however, that we have not sufficient inspectors and border patrol personnel to properly guard the back door?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is one of the many reasons.

Mr. KEEFE. Is there any other reason?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; many.

Mr. KEEFE. Is not that the principal reason?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is one of the big reasons.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman arguing for an increase in the border patrol?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am going to do that; yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. And an increase in the number of inspectors?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am going to do that, too.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the Budget very drastically cut those items?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am going to go into that in a few moments. The two gentlemen have very kindly given me 5 additional minutes apiece, and I want to talk about that matter because it ought to be called to the attention of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe, if there is a substantial increase in the border patrol and in the inspection service of the present Immigration Service that we have laws on the statute books now to effectively stop this so-called back-door entrance of illegal aliens?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman to the extent of about 75 percent. Our committee, however, that has charge of these matters would like to know who constitutes the smuggling ring and how it is operating, and we can find out if the Committee on Rules, that is dominating these

questions, will give us an opportunity to make a study of this problem which has not been studied for 30 years. For the information of the House, I may say these so-called smuggling operations deal mostly with Chinese, Japanese, and such people whom we have excluded under our present immigration laws. I do not want to impugn the patriotic motives of the distinguished members of the important Rules Committee. I realize that all of them are outstanding Members of this House, whom I respect highly. However, I do think that, not being in close touch with this particular problem, they fail to realize its importance. I do not blame them for that. I know that they have enough problems of their own to deal with. The least I would expect of them, however, is to show more confidence and faith in the judgment of the full membership of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman understand that the present facilities of the Bureau of Immigration and its border patrol and inspector activities are fully aware of the sources of illegal entrance of aliens into this country, but that they are burdened because of a lack of personnel?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman to a certain extent. Let me add, however, that there is certain information that came to the attention of the committee which requires a subpoena and testimony to develop. The Labor Department has no power of subpoena, no power to investigate. They are law-enforcing officers. They cannot get the information we would like to get so that we can put teeth in our laws on this whole question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have before me the resolution to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is speaking of the Schulte resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. I am absolutely in favor of getting rid of any alien who is in this country illegally and of preventing the illegal entrance of any alien. However, the gentleman is the chairman of a committee of this House—the Immigration Committee—and it seems to me that under the rules of the House the gentleman has all the power right now that is necessary in order to make a study of all existing statutes, Executive orders, rules, regulations, instructions, and general orders which relate to the immigration, deportation, naturalization, and so forth, of aliens.

Does the gentleman mean to tell me that his committee does not have the power to call before it the officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service? I know that the rules of the House of Representatives give him that power.

The gentleman speaks about an investigation. The immigration border patrol and the immigration officials have full power to investigate, to arrest, and to apply for deportation orders. The gentleman has the power right now to do practically what he desires to do under the resolution. If it then develops that further investigation is necessary, that might be the time to go after the Rules Committee. I do not believe the gentleman is justified in blaming this on the Rules Committee until his own committee, the committee of which he is chairman, does what this resolution in part provides.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is exactly the stage we have come to. We have gone into all the matters concerning which the gentleman says we have the power to act, and we have come to the conclusion by unanimous vote, after days and days of discussion by the committee, that the committee should direct and authorize our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE], to go a step further by introducing this resolution. We found we had come to the end of our power. The end of our power is in paragraph 2, with reference to investigating unlawful entry and smuggling of aliens into the United States. There are certain persons in certain sections of the country that want exemption from criminal prosecution, when they will disclose a certain state of facts to the effect that an international group is bringing in Chinamen or Japanese or other orientals from Mexico.

The Labor Department has no power to subpoena anybody, and the committee certainly has no power to do it.

Mr. COCHRAN. But has not the Labor Department the power to arrest them?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Labor Department often cannot get all the necessary evidence, although they have tried hard to do it and have arrested a great number of people. We have a great Labor Department and its personnel is beyond any reproach.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then why does not the gentleman's committee, the legislative committee, bring in a bill increasing the force so they can get the evidence?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We will come to that.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is the chairman of the legislative committee that can bring in such an authorization.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I say that it seems that this argument is always presented to me but to no other chairman of a committee. They are always trying to find a way to say "No" to an investigation. That same argument was presented to me by dozens of Members on the floor when I stood up here asking for the adoption of the resolution creating the Dies committee, but no such argument was made after the resolution was adopted. You have given that committee \$200,000 to do what? To investigate un-American activities. And here I am asking for probably \$10,000 to stop the flood of bad aliens into this country. It will save appropriating millions of dollars later to deport them after they come into this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I will add 3 minutes to the gentleman's time so that I may ask him a few questions.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman that now is the time it is necessary to take preventative steps in this matter. A great world war is now going on. The gentleman recalls that at the close of the last World War almost half the people of Europe wished to come to America. The situation is developing in the same way today.

The people who have written from my border about this situation say it is Europeans who are being smuggled across the line, whereas the gentleman has mentioned orientals more particularly. I expect to see this evil develop by leaps and bounds, not only with respect to orientals but also Europeans trying to get away from the war-stricken countries to come here.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I say to my good friend that I do not agree with him on that point. I have taken the trouble to make a very careful check-up on that, and I have found that there are involved only a very few persons, who have been living on the borders for some time, and they are not in a true sense of the word European refugees at all. The European refugees in these days cannot get out of their countries without a passport, and then need proper identification for every move they make.

May I add this to the whole discussion: Would it not be worth the price to give the committee that is in charge of the subject and responsible for the legislation an opportunity to go into all these matters? I call the attention of the Members to the fact that in the last few years 28 American border patrolmen have been killed in cold blood by smuggling rings. Do you believe the Labor Department can find out who is doing all this shooting? There seems to be a racket, and probably an international group. If a subcommittee can go down there and subpoena certain persons, we can get information on this activity so we can bring in laws with teeth in them. I should like to see war veterans by the hundreds guard our borders.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.



Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Under the gentleman's proposal, will the committee be permitted to investigate all the illegal entrances along the borders?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; they would or anywhere else.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. How much will that cost?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It would not cost more than \$10,000.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I believe the gentleman's committee ought to have \$25,000 or \$50,000 in view of the unemployment in the country. It would be money well spent. I would like to make a suggestion that the gentleman introduce his bill providing for \$50,000 or \$100,000 to carry on this necessary work, and then wait 30 days and if action is not taken on it by the committee, he should then file a discharge petition and get the bill out on the floor of the House. With more than 11,000,000 people out of work in the United States today we should be able to put your bill across as it will materially help stop aliens from entering the country illegally and getting jobs which our unemployed need.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate that. The gentleman probably was not here when I stated that we have been unanimous in the committee about getting this resolution out of the Rules Committee. One day they voted it out and the next day they took it back and the next day they reported it back and later took it back and then they said they wanted some amendments and then someone said that it might trespass upon the integrity of the Dies committee by investigating aliens. I do not know that the Dies committee has anything to do with the investigation of aliens.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I sincerely hope the gentleman will file a discharge petition so that we will have an opportunity to provide for an adequate authorization and appropriation. Should we spend as much money for the investigation which the gentleman's committee desires as we spend for the Dies committee we would be rendering a great service to the country, because there are now more than 11,000,000 unemployed Americans in our country who want and need a job and should have one instead of aliens who illegally enter.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am fully in accord with the gentleman.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHULTE. Is it not a fact that had this resolution been adopted 5 or 6 years ago and had this committee been given the power to go to the various borders and find out for themselves just what legislation was necessary to correct this situation, there would not have been any necessity for the Dies committee working today, because 90 percent of those people they are picking up are the fellows who have come in illegally and that we have been trying for a long time to stop?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And how many times has my friend been before the Rules Committee?

Mr. SCHULTE. I have been before the Rules Committee any number of times, and each time we are passed over with some excuse or other. I cannot understand the action of the Rules Committee, I will say to my friend.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I believe the editorials in the newspapers in the State of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and in other States, have discussed the Schulte resolution and have stated that it would be a great help for the Congress if the committee were given the authority and enough money at this time, in view of the chaos and the general disturbance in the country, so as to be able to make a study of this problem and find out the true situation so that we may legislate intelligently.

Mr. SCHULTE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am going to make a statement to the House that I believe is going to be very illuminating, to the effect that sailors off of the ships that land on our shores testified before the committee and admitted that they were bringing over as many as 100 extra sailors on board their ships who are hired as sailors, or supposed to be sailors, but when they land here they are given the freedom of the port and immediately desert.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Coming from German ships, from the North German Lloyd, there may be a ship that needs only 750 men, but will have 850 or 900, and the other 200 are only spies sent over to do espionage work in the United States.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. There is one thing I do not understand—

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We will make the gentleman understand it if we can.

Mr. PATRICK. And that is, how anybody could present a proposition charging that the work the gentleman seeks to do would, in any wise, infringe on the work of the Dies committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman, but that was the inference drawn by distinguished Members on both sides of the Rules Committee, where we have been knocking at the door for almost 1 year pleading with them to do something not for the benefit of any individual, but for the benefit of the country in letting us find out what could be done about this problem. They have just given us the merry-go-round and I think the country ought to know it.

Mr. PATRICK. Did the gentleman say that this is a piece of work that has already been done, that it was already started once, but the last Rules Committee did not support the first rule?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

Mr. PATRICK. Did the gentleman get such a rule once?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We got a rule once unanimously. It was voted out and they called it back and said it was too much power. We had asked to go into the question of dual nationality and they objected to the words "dual nationality." Now, what is dual nationality? There are at least from 100,000 to 200,000 people in this country that are citizens of two countries. They are citizens of Germany or some other country, and they are citizens of the United States. It was the purpose of the committee to make a study of that and to cancel the certificates of those people that have two masters. They cannot be hyphenated Americans. They are either Americans or they are not, and if they want to pledge allegiance to Hitler and at the same time hold a certificate of citizenship of Uncle Sam, they should be forced to make up their minds and we ought to get at the bottom of that whole situation. The distinguished Rules Committee, however, and one or two other distinguished Members, said that it was giving the committee too much power to find out how many people of dual nationalities there are in the country.

Mr. PATRICK. Did any question come up as to the sum of money asked by the committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; they were not interested in that. They thought it would be a big job. It is only in the last 2 weeks that a gentleman asked me how much it would take.

Mr. PATRICK. I do not see how they got by with the matter.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Because they had in their mind to give us what is known as a run-around. They were going to "pass the buck." Some Member would blame another Member, and another Member would blame the leadership, and so on. In the meantime, however, we are overlooking a very serious problem in this country, and I do not think there is a Member on this floor, if that resolution were reported out, who would vote against it, because he would be doing an injustice to his country.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is the chairman of the Committee on Immigration. Does he have any information about the character and number of illegal entries coming into the port of New York?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. None at all. The only illegal entrances are along the borders.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman has not any special information about the matter?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, I have. There is no illegal entrance in Boston or New York or any other regular immigration port. Our trouble is with the back door.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman does not think there is a lot of illegal entries of a lot of special groups?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; and I can give the gentleman proof.

Mr. COCHRAN. Has the gentleman any specific information in reference to illegal entries? If so, why not deport them? That is what should be done with them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, I have so much information, including information from Father Coughlin, that 50,000 Spaniards were smuggled across the border. But I have no means to check that. We have no appropriation to do it. I sent some of the information over to the Department of Justice and some of it to the Department of Labor, but the crux of the whole argument is, Why should not the committee of this Congress that is responsible for this legislation have the first power to go and make a study and check up as to who are the liars and who are not? But you will not give us that chance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to get along as quickly as I can.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to say to the gentleman from New York, in round figures, the Congress increased the appropriation for F. B. I. \$2,600,000 during the present session. This was to meet emergencies. Surely if aliens are entering this country illegally it is the duty of this organization to take those in custody who are violating our immigration laws. They do not have to have any specific authorization to do so. I am sure Mr. Hoover will welcome any information the gentleman from New York or any other Member has. The F. B. I. is charged with certain responsibilities. Surely a congressional committee could not do the job of apprehending those who violate our laws. All this committee would do would be to get information. Why not give the leads to Mr. Hoover and let him make an investigation?

The gentleman from Arizona will be welcomed by Mr. Hoover. If our laws are such as to allow farm labor to enter this country for seasonal work, then why not bring in a bill putting a stop to such a practice. I will vote for it, and it will pass with few, if any, dissenting votes. Nothing should be left undone to save all the available jobs for American labor.

It was said aliens from the countries at war will flood our borders after the war. We can stop that, and we should stop it. Further restriction of immigrants should be our goal rather than letting down the bars. Let the Committee on Immigration, of which the gentleman from New York is chairman, first bring in the necessary legislation to meet some of the evils complained of or conditions that might face us in the future and then speak of investigations after those laws are passed. I would also suggest to the gentleman from New York to start an investigation now under the rules, as his committee has the power. Get testimony from the Government departments, and then if it is developed he has a case, press the resolution for a general investigation. Above all, I say to the gentleman from New York, as well as any other Member who has information of violations of our immigration laws, give it to the F. B. I. and that organization will apprehend the guilty.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I say to my friend that I have the highest regard for the F. B. I., and particular for the Director of that Bureau, Mr. Hoover. They are a great body of men, they have been doing a good job. I was sorry to see them criticized last week in the press, and in other statements made in this Capitol, but what I want is action. I want to go down to the root of the matter. The Committee on Immigration knows where to go. I do not want them to assign the hundreds of matters and complaints to hundreds of agents, and then wait for a report for months and months. The committee can go right in and furthermore, the Department of Justice has no power to subpoena and the gentleman has forgotten that. The gentleman raised the same question with me in the matter of the Dies committee. He must remember that.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Department of Justice agents have the power to arrest, and they will go any place, if the gentleman from New York will only tell them where to go, if he will give them the information he says he has. That is what the organization is for.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have given the gentleman my best judgment and my honest belief and he can take it or leave it.

Mr. Chairman, my attention has been directed to the proposal of the 1941 Budget to lower certain funds for field administration of the Immigration and Naturalization Service below the 1940 appropriation levels. The net decrease proposed is \$281,310, arrived at by cutting \$154,310 off the field-salary item for immigrant inspectors, border-patrol inspectors, and other personnel in the field, also decreasing general field expenses by \$140,000, and adding \$13,000 for repairing immigration stations.

I am particularly concerned at the proposal to reduce the field-salary item by some \$154,000, because the breakdown in the Budget shows a consequent loss of 96 inspectional positions to the present total authorized strength of 1,736 immigrant inspectors and border-patrol inspectors; in other words, the Budget, 1941, proposes to cut the inspectional strength, the enforcement arm of the Service, between 5 and 6 percent below present authorization.

I have heard no reason advanced to justify the proposal to so impair immigration enforcement in the field service, and indeed I can conceive of none. My reaction to this particular Budget estimate is that instead of proposing a small saving, the proposition actually is that we take a substantial loss within a year or two or three, when the resulting impairment of immigration enforcement will become apparent and when we shall be afflicted with an aggravated deportation problem. We should regard any proposition to cut field immigration funds as meaning an increased number of illegally entered aliens, increased smuggling activities from nearby territories, increased burdens on our jails and almshouses, and, I hardly need say, on our taxpayers.

Those of us who are in touch with immigration control realize full well that with conditions in Europe as they now are and the consequent pressure on our immigration quotas, and with alien subversive groups already here but inspired from abroad in their un-American activities, the present would be about the worst time in our history to effect petty immediate savings by curtailing our immigration field inspectional force. I speak advisedly when I say to this House that we should hesitate to encourage immigration law violators, and I mean both the aliens themselves and their smugglers, by even suggesting that there is now being considered this proposal in the Budget to deplete our force of immigrant and border-patrol inspectors. In my committee work I have come to see a very close relation between vigorous field inspectional activities and suppressed immigration-law violations. I have come to see that in just about the measure we supply our field force with inspectors and funds we demonstrate our control of the so-called alien problem. And I realize, too, that there is no economy in weakening immigration inspectional personnel now, only to have to increase the force later and supply increased funds for expenses attendant upon disposing of an accumulation of aliens who have taken advantage of us and gained unlawful entry.

Any way you look at the proposal to cut immigration inspectional strength it is poor business. It may be pennies saved now, but you may be assured that we shall have to spend dollars later to get us back anywhere even with the game. And all this is simply a cold-blooded way of looking at a most dangerous proposition from the point of view of dollars and cents. It takes no account of the more serious aspects of applying a penny-wise policy to immigration field activities. A fact we often overlook is that it is the least desirable, and the criminal classes of aliens who seek illegal means of entry, because they cannot qualify through regular inspection channels. For that situation, therefore, we are compelled at all times to maintain a well-organized border patrol, to operate at points removed from regular designated ports of entry, and to apprehend and deflect into regular



inspection channels those particularly undesirable aliens that seek to evade regular inspection.

It is axiomatic that laws will not enforce themselves. We have gone on passing more and more immigration statutes for the past half century, imposing greater and greater burdens of administration, with comparatively little increase in the official force that must be relied on to make these many statutes effective. The time has come for Congress to recognize that immigration control is an essential service of the Government, than which no law-enforcement activity of this Government is more important in its bearing on the moral and physical well-being of the American public. Regulation of aliens either entering the United States or already here is of the highest import to our employment conditions, our social conditions, and, I may add, to our political conditions. Any proposal to weaken the field arm of immigration enforcement is of the same order of merit as a proposal to withdraw police protection from a given community. It is one of those things that we cannot afford to do.

I have said that no reason has been advanced for proposing to curtail immigration field activities and I have indicated my opinion that the only explanation of this proposal is a sense of false economy in the minds of our budgetary authorities. There are, however, plenty of reasons aside from those I have stated why a cut in immigration inspection personnel is not justified. There is nothing to indicate any lessened need for immigration enforcement at this time. The opposite is true, as we find in the most recent annual report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, for the year ending June 30, 1939, in which the Commissioner emphasizes "the immense volume of inspection work" required of the Service, added enforcement burdens, increased number of ports of entry requiring 24-hour inspection, "shortage of regular immigrant inspectors at ports of entry," an already inadequate border patrol force, the necessity constantly arising for detaching border-patrol inspectors away from their patrol duties to perform immigrant-inspector duties at ports of entry, the pressing need of strengthening the patrol force because of present European conditions, and greatly increased registry and naturalization work.

The Commissioner's annual report does not mention the increased number of immigrant inspectors and border-patrol inspectors that his Service requires to properly staff the ports of entry and international border points so that the Service may be able to cope with the very situations described in his annual report. Perhaps budgetary restrictions prevent setting forth needs of increased personnel, but however that may be, we know that a year ago when the 1940 Budget was in the course of preparation, the various field immigration district heads did make known their respective needs for approximately 500 additional officers, mostly immigrant inspectors and border-patrol inspectors. It is a rather sad commentary to note that the 1940 appropriation provided for exactly 11 additions to the inspection force. In the light of this experience, it is probable that immigration district heads have been discouraged from reporting their present needs for added inspectional personnel, but from various sources of information I learn that conditions are at least as bad as they were a year ago, and I am impelled to the conclusion that Congress should now determine for itself just what measure of immigration law enforcement it desires, and rather than entertain proposals to cut the existing Service activities, should consider how the Service may be restored to proper law-enforcement capabilities.

Further analysis of the 1941 Budget shows that the field salary item appropriated for 1940 is in the amount of \$8,133,420, which figure includes \$233,000 provided by the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act for the employment of temporary help to overcome an arrearage in naturalization activity. I note that the 1941 Budget estimates for the next fiscal year for the field-salary item the amount of \$7,979,110 and continues in this figure the \$233,000 for temporary employees to overcome naturalization arrearage. Most Members in this House are undoubtedly aware of the present attendant delay in naturalization process throughout the country and would like to see that process expedited so far as the law per-

mits, but in spite of our very natural feelings on that subject we should not lose sight of the fact that delay in the naturalization process is at most an inconvenience to aliens already legally here, whereas weakened inspectional strength by any reduction of the force of immigrant inspectors and border-patrol inspectors will throw upon our hands an increased number of illegal alien entrants and open up a field of increased immigration law violations. I submit, too, that it is a most incongruous situation to continue an amount of \$233,000 for the employment of temporary help in naturalization work in the Service field activities and at the same time propose to cut the permanent field establishment of the Service by a similar sum.

I am constantly being reminded of the country-wide interest in the subject of adequate, efficient immigration enforcement, and I am in receipt of resolutions and petitions of the following character:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,

RAYMOND C. PAUL, Post, No. 880,

Galveston, Tex., February 28, 1940.

The Honorable SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,

Representative from New York, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will find a resolution as adopted by Post 880, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Texas, at their regular meeting held here in Galveston Monday, February 26, 1940, and is self-explanatory.

We, as representative citizens and war veterans, are very much opposed to any and all reductions contemplated for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in fact, it is our honest opinion that the appropriation for said service should be increased by the amount it is proposed to decrease same, in order to place more inspectors and guards along our borders and shore lines.

Respectfully yours,

M. H. GOSWICK,  
Post Commander.

Whereas we have been reliably informed that there is a proposed reduction of appropriation by the House Subcommittee in Charge of Labor Department Appropriations for the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and

Whereas this decrease in appropriation will affect no less than 96 immigrant and patrol inspectors in the field and 27 junior-clerk positions; and

Whereas the proposed reductions in appropriation for salaries of immigrant inspectors and other employees in the field mean unemployment for many of them, unless absorbed by other departments;

Whereas the positions to be vacated are now held by many war veterans and other former service men; and

Whereas the recent passage of the deportation bill by the Senate increased the duties of an already overburdened Immigration and Naturalization Service; and

Whereas strict enforcement of such legislation is particularly important at this time, in view of the international situation created by the war abroad; and

Whereas with the conclusion of the war abroad, there will be a great exodus of aliens for our shores and borders, with many of them seeking their entry illegally: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Raymond C. Paul Post 880, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in regular meeting at Galveston, Tex., this 26th day of February 1940, respectfully request that the subcommittee in charge of the Labor Department appropriations will make a careful study of the facts presented by the above resolution, before reducing the appropriation for this wonderful service, which is charged with one of the most important duties of our Government and which receives but little public acclaim.

That a copy of this resolution to be attached to and made part of the minutes of this meeting.

M. H. GOSWICK,  
Post Commander.

Attest:

R. S. MILLER,  
Adjutant.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] 5 minutes.

A MAUSOLEUM FOR BOOKS OR A SERVICE STATION, WHICH?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am especially interested in the appropriation contained in this bill for the Library of Congress. As a school superintendent for 30 years, I have had direct contact with school libraries, public libraries, and college libraries. I know, therefore, something about libraries at first hand.

From my contact with libraries I have learned that many are simply depositories for books, mausoleums for books, while others are service stations where a person may go to get necessary information. Some library staffs limit their activities to the proper checking in and checking out of

books, while other library staffs are sources of information and helpfulness that assist people to discover and use the information that the library walls enclose.

During my time in Congress I have had occasion to gather data, information, statistics, on various subjects to be used as material for speeches. I am fortunate in having a young man in my office that has used libraries extensively, knows the technique of library use, and is also acquainted with the set-up and the staff of the Congressional Library. He has done my library work for me since I came to Washington.

Our Congressional Library is one of the best equipped libraries in the world, but it is not the best staffed. There is plenty of room for improving the personnel of the library staff.

The new library head has visions of making the library a real service station, and he is asking for the funds necessary to do this.

When some of you men first came to Congress you had neither an office nor a secretary. Then you were given an office and one secretary. Later on, because the people began to consider a Congressman's office a service station, you were allowed two secretaries. Now with so many Government bureaus and departments, and the constantly increasing demand for service from back home, you are allowed three secretaries to help you give the service that is expected and demanded of you.

In the same way if the Congressional Library is to be utilized completely, if it is to give the service expected of it, then we must provide the required staff to increase its usefulness, so that the enormous investment in that institution can pay the dividends that it should be paying to the public and to the people on the Hill. My vote, as I see it, upon the request for increased funds for the operation of the Congressional Library will indicate whether we want the Congressional Library to be a mausoleum for books, or whether we want it to become a live up-to-date, well-staffed service station. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, it had been my purpose to offer an amendment to this bill on page 28, line 3, where you will find the item of \$350,000 for the purpose of repairing the terrace of this building on the west. After consulting with the leaders of this committee, I have decided not to offer that amendment for the reason that I have been informed it would be impossible to stop the serious damage and leaks on that side of the Capitol without this expenditure. Years ago when leaks developed on that side of the building the Architect of the Capitol was able to stop those leaks with an expenditure of approximately \$60,000. I am informed that so much damage has been done to that side of the building since that time that it is now absolutely necessary to make the entire repairs as explained to the committee by the Architect, and that it will require the full expenditure asked in this bill.

I also withhold that amendment because I am assured the Architect and those who are to do this work will not install windows on that side of the Capitol where there are no windows at this time, and that no other construction will be made there which in any way will erase any valuable architecture, or in any way deface the historic construction of the building. My original opposition to this item was because of my original opposition to the bill which is introduced in Congress every year, which has as its objective the changing of the front of the United States Capitol. I call your attention to the fact that this bill is before Congress nearly every year, and that there is a determined movement on foot to change the front of the Capitol by moving the center portion of the Capitol forward, eastward, to conform with the House and Senate wings. I opposed that because I fear that considerable historical architecture will be destroyed and eliminated, architecture which is valuable and which should be preserved for the present generation and

generations to follow. For that reason I took some exception to some of the reconstruction work which was to be done on the west side of the Capitol, fearing that perhaps when they got to constructing and reconstructing this historic building on the west side, there might be some danger that they would destroy some valuable architecture, that they might in some way deface our Nation's Capitol; that they might eliminate something which you and I see today, something which was built by our forefathers, which is a part of the historical portions of this structure, which you and I should always be zealous in protecting for the present and future generations of our people.

For that reason I want my objection to be recorded here against anything which may in any way deface this historic building. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we notice a great deal of discussion in the press, over the radio, and elsewhere with reference to a third term for the President of the United States. I shall therefore read a very pertinent editorial from the Wausau (Wis.) Record-Herald on this highly important question, as follows:

#### THE BOSSES TURN "THIRD-TERMITES"

Call the roll of the really important political machines in American politics and it will be seen that all the Democratic ones—so far as cursory observation goes—are on record for a third term for Roosevelt.

Strange! Boss Hague, Boss Kelly, Boss Maestri, Boss Crump—they never have had much reputation as reformers. They never were known to have a great urge to "make America over." They have always played the idea that American life was already plenty abundant to suit them. Why this sudden passion for reform, experiment, and the New Deal?

Maybe the example of Boss Pendergast has something to do with it. The Kansas City boss fell foul of the New Deal and he went to jail. His machine crumpled up at the recent election. Boss Pendergast is all washed up. And there have been Federal grand juries in towns here and there, such as New Orleans, where Maestri's domination lies—but no indictments as yet. Maestri's organization is for a third term. Maybe there won't be any indictments after all.

Pinko New Dealers have been extremely unkind in their criticism of Jersey City's reactionary boss, Mayor Hague, which makes it all the stranger that he should be so strong for continuation of the New Deal. And Boss GUFFEY is positively tearful about a third term, seeing as Pennsylvania has elections this year and he's up for reelection.

The explanation of this curious congeries of political bedfellows is, of course, plain enough. Roosevelt believes in spending, and spending public money is the specialty of the bosses. If Mr. Roosevelt doesn't run again, or at least if the New Deal isn't continued, the bosses won't have a Federal trough to feed at.

Third termites, almost to a man, are the lads who are on the pay roll, directly or indirectly. A third term for Roosevelt means 4 years more in the money. If it doesn't happen, the boys have a reasonable expectation of getting the ax.

What's a 150-year-old tradition founded by Washington and Jefferson, and respected ever since, between such friends as the bosses and the pay roll?

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD].

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, a clear indication that the Government's business is of no concern of the people is pointed out in the reply I received from the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency in response to my inquiry for information, desired not by myself alone but by a committee of this Congress. Mr. Upham, in point of fact, says that the people are not entitled to information or an explanation as to what is being done with their money. This is just another example of insolence on the part of a branch of this dominant bureaucracy and maladministration of our Government.

The controversy in question is based first on a statement made by the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency before the Treasury Post Office Subcommittee during its hearings in December 1939. After I had sought for nearly a month to obtain a detailed statement of fees involved in the largest bank receivership in the country's history, the Comptroller of the Currency has refused to make known to a committee



of Congress details of the cost of the receivership of the First National Bank, of Detroit, Michigan, on the grounds that to do so "might only confuse the public mind and hinder the work of the receivership."

I requested the information as a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handling Treasury budgets. My original request, early in February, followed testimony before the committee that legal fees alone totaled \$922,000 to September 30, 1939.

In order that the situation may be thoroughly understood by the Congress, let me state that on February 14 I wrote the following letter to the Comptroller of the Currency:

FEBRUARY 14, 1940.

HON. PRESTON DELANO,  
Comptroller of the Currency,

United States Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DELANO: It has come to my attention that statements recently made to the Treasury Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am a member, regarding the receivership of the First National Bank, Detroit, were not in accordance with the facts.

Therefore, I will appreciate it if you will provide me, as a member of this subcommittee, with a detailed statement of the cost of this receivership for each of its 7 years; and that such statement list the names and amounts of payments made to attorneys for fees and all other legal costs incurred by this receivership.

Trusting that I may have an early reply, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,  
Member of Congress.

I want you to keep that letter in mind for just a few moments, because the question I asked is contained therein. The Comptroller's reply to this letter, dated February 23, reads as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,  
Washington, February 23, 1940.

HON. CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCLEOD: Reference is made to your letter of February 14, 1940, wherein you advise that certain statements recently made to the Treasury Appropriations Subcommittee, of which you are a member, regarding the receivership of the First National Bank, Detroit, were not in accordance with the facts.

We have very carefully reviewed the report of the committee hearing and do not find that any statements made by us at the hearing were not in accordance with the facts, and feel that your informant, who called the statements in question to your attention, must have been mistaken concerning them. We are, of course, desirous of correcting any erroneous impression which may have been given as the result of any of the statements made, and, consequently, we will appreciate it very much if you will advise us more specifically concerning the particular statements to which your informant may have referred. If, as indicated by your letter, the statements had reference to expense of liquidation, we may advise that annual reports submitted to Congress by the Comptroller of the Currency disclose that the cost of liquidation of this receivership has been substantially less than the average cost of liquidation of all national-bank receiverships. In this connection it may be pointed out that the Comptroller's published annual report to Congress for the year ended October 31, 1938, indicates the average cost of liquidation of all national-bank receiverships to such date as 6.08 percent of total collections, whereas the comparable cost of liquidation of the First National Bank, Detroit, receivership is found to have been but 4.18 percent. Such percentage of total costs of liquidation of the First National Bank, Detroit, receivership will, however, be reduced to 2.54 percent if amounts of interest paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are excluded from total liquidation costs. Total legal expense of this receivership, including court costs, services of attorneys, and other costs incident to litigation paid as of October 31, 1938, is found to have amounted to less than one-fifth of 1 percent of total collections, and only 7.3 percent of total costs of liquidation, exclusive of interest, paid the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

We shall be glad to hear from you further concerning this matter. Very truly yours,

C. B. UPHAM, Deputy Comptroller.

I read from my letter of February 28, my second identical request of the Comptroller:

FEBRUARY 28, 1940.

MR. C. B. UPHAM,

Deputy Comptroller of the Currency,  
Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. UPHAM: I have your letter of February 23 which is in reply to my letter of February 14 addressed to Mr. Delano, Comptroller of the Currency.

While your letter contains general information, if you will refer to the second paragraph of my letter of February 14, you will note that I asked for specific information. Therefore, I again request

that you provide me with a detailed statement of cost of this receivership for each of its 7 years, and that such statement list the names and payments made to attorneys for this receivership and all other legal charges.

Assuring you that I will appreciate your cooperation, I remain  
Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,  
Member of Congress.

You will note that I asked for "specific information" in both of these letters, that my second letter repeated the same request. The day before yesterday I finally received a reply to mine of February 28, excerpts of which I will quote in a moment.

Twice I asked the same question, for him to state the specific amount of the cost of the receivership, specifically to name the amount of fees paid attorneys and the names of the attorneys so paid. That was my only question, and now from his letter I quote:

In the present letter you drop that matter entirely and request new information which was not among the questions asked by the members of the subcommittee.

I must take a more serious view of the situation thus created. It was I who undertook to answer the queries of the subcommittee and the answers which you alleged to be false in a letter to the Comptroller were mine. While I do not say that an error might not have occurred, I do wish you and the other members of the subcommittee to know that I desire to correct any misstatement of facts contained in my answers. I repeat, as emphatically as I am able, that in justice to the office which I represent and in fairness to the Comptroller, who relied upon me in this matter, I am entitled to a more particular recital of the information then given which you believe to be wrong.

I ask you, gentlemen of the House, if the request I submitted in both these letters was not clear.

MR. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. MCLEOD. I yield.

MR. RABAUT. Has the gentleman a copy of the hearings wherein the questions were asked?

MR. MCLEOD. They are in the Treasury hearings, and the hearings are available to all Members.

MR. RABAUT. Has the gentleman a copy with him?

MR. MCLEOD. They are here.

MR. RABAUT. Are they not the questions that were asked in the hearings?

MR. MCLEOD. Yes.

MR. RABAUT. Are not they the things in question?

MR. MCLEOD. Yes.

MR. RABAUT. Why does not the gentleman present the questions asked in the hearings to substantiate the whole matter? Did the gentleman hear my question?

MR. MCLEOD. I am talking about the question I asked in my letters.

MR. RABAUT. They are all set out in the hearings, I take it.

MR. MCLEOD. I asked a certain specific question in my letter, if the gentleman would only pay attention to what I am getting at.

MR. RABAUT. I am paying attention.

MR. MCLEOD. I am going to cite the questions that were asked in the hearings; they will all come out. If the gentleman would just pay attention to what I am saying, it would all be clear.

The next paragraph of this letter states:

In this letter you renew your request for a detailed statement of the cost of the receivership of the First National Bank, Detroit, for each of its 7 years, which shall include the names of attorneys representing the receiver and the payments made to them.

He admits now that I am repeating my original request.

This is not the first time such a request has been made. We presume that the size of this receivership and the very large amounts involved have generated a great deal of curiosity in the minds of many people. In fact one prominent member of the Detroit bar recently brought an action in court to compel the Comptroller to furnish this and other similar information and to bring about a situation whereby he might acquire the privilege of review of future expenses before payment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MR. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. McLEOD. The letter goes on to say:

Whether such procedure would promote efficient and impartial liquidation I must leave you to judge; but in attempting to furnish information piecemeal and without relating it to the whole receivership we might only confuse the public mind and hinder the work of the receiver, on whom scores of thousands are depending for the return of their deposits. What is meant can be easily made clear by a few examples.

The pay roll of the hundreds of employees runs into a sizeable figure. The figure, viewed alone, might be made to seem exorbitant; but you will realize, I am sure, that no responsible person would hazard an opinion upon it without a knowledge of the work to be done, the quality of the organization of the clerical staff, the amount of special knowledge or training necessary, and the level of wages in the community. The salary paid to the receiver, viewed by itself, will convey differing impressions to those who may hear of it, depending upon their own experience in such matters, but you will realize that intelligent comment must include a knowledge of the requirements of the position. The question of legal expense is peculiarly of this nature. A statement made on legal-fee bills during the course of a receivership must necessarily be inadequate, since the total is never known until the trust is finally closed.

That is the only answer the Comptroller makes regarding legal fees. Up to the present time, according to the receiver's figure, the legal fees are just under \$1,000,000. The information I received stated there will be further legal fees due.

Moreover, the bald statement of fees paid over a period of time for widely diversified services, or for a single service, is meaningless in itself. A similar comment might be made upon any feature of the receivership viewed without relation to the entire problem.

The receivership of the First National Bank, Detroit, represents the greatest task of bank liquidation ever undertaken in this country.

We will concede that.

At this time over 175,000 persons are interested in its outcome. The liquidation of \$468,000,000 of bank assets is a project reaching into every State and affecting persons in every walk of life.

That is why this is a matter of national concern.

Almost every type of property must be converted to cash; many thousands of unwilling debtors and shareholders must be forced to pay, and exact justice must be done among the creditors in making distribution. The efficient management of this liquidation is of major importance, not only to Detroit but to the entire State of Michigan, and this office has at all times endeavored to meet its responsibilities to Congress and to maintain a clear sense of trusteeship. The receivership, in its key positions, has been manned by trained and experienced men, and capable and impartial counsel has been employed. Our success or failure in performing our duties will be evident in the results, and we must presume that Congress intends that we have some freedom of action if the responsibility is upon our shoulders. The general information given you in our letter of February 23 will afford you some yardstick by which to measure the administrative expenses incurred at this receivership. A copy of the latest published statement of condition of the receivership is enclosed for your information.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot recall a time when a committee of Congress has been refused information of this kind or nature. Every depositor of this large bank must be asking the question today: If the bank is now solvent after \$20,000,000 has been milked from its assets to run this receivership, why was it not allowed to reopen years ago?

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is chairman of this subcommittee, and I am going to ask him to direct a letter to the Comptroller or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is very much interested in this situation. Perhaps he, as chairman of this committee, can get the definite figures that I believe the people of Detroit and Michigan are entitled to, because it is their money that is paying for this receivership which seems to be ever-continuous. There are no signs of closing the receivership. As I understand it, it is one of the few remaining important banks held in receivership since the bank holiday of more than 7 years ago.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. To refer to the Treasury Department hearings, it appears on page 274, that the total expenditure for attorneys' fees to September 30, 1939, was \$922,373.13. On page 276 of the hearings it appears that the expenditures for attorneys' fees up to the end of the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1939, was \$741,000—a difference of \$181,000 which

must have been spent in the 3 months from July 1, 1939, to September 30, 1939.

On page 273 of the hearings, it appears that the total annual salary rate of all attorneys as of June 30, 1939, was \$18,120 and they were spending \$181,000 in 3 months. These two stories do not go together. In other words, in accordance with their own testimony they appear to have spent 10 times as much in 3 months as they told us they were going to spend in a whole year.

Mr. McLEOD. The gentleman is correct. The specific liquidation charge, which is supposed to include attorneys' fees, was more than \$11,728,121 as of December 31, 1939. If it is a fact, and the information is correct, that there are bills still to be rendered for attorneys' fees against this bank in question, I think specific information, when requested, should be given to a committee of Congress with reference to what is actually going on.

I know the people of Detroit are anxious to know how much of the \$922,000 that was paid for attorneys' fees was paid to Robert S. Marx and Frank E. Wood, Cincinnati lawyers, to look after the liquidation of Detroit's biggest bank.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, rural electrification is a glowing example of humanized democracy. It is lifting the burden of toil off the backs of farmers and their wives. It is harnessed electricity made to serve man. It has banished gloom and despair and lighted up the halls of farm homes with joy and comfort. It has brought to rural life comforts, conveniences, and economies which were heretofore enjoyed only by city dwellers, and is rapidly causing the drift of people from cities to farms rather than from farms to cities. Rural electrification was in fact made possible through establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority about 6 years ago. It was my happy privilege to preside over the House of Representatives the day the T. V. A. was created and also to vote for this measure.

Prior to the creation of the T. V. A. there were comparatively few farms in the country which had rural electrification. Occasionally a prosperous farmer had been able to install his own small Delco outfit, but electrical power was a high luxury and not to be even dreamed of by the average farmer. We will take, for instance, the charges made by the Mississippi Power Co., which is near the T. V. A., which charges were for 1,400 kilowatt-hours under the old rate, and compare them with the T. V. A. rate of 7½ mills a kilowatt-hour of today.

Residential rates

	Mississippi Power Co. rates, 1932	Present Tennessee Valley Authority rates
First 30 kilowatt-hours a month.....	\$3.00	\$0.90
Next 170 kilowatt-hours a month.....	13.60	3.60
Next 300 kilowatt-hours a month.....	21.00	2.40
Next 350 kilowatt-hours a month.....	21.00	1.40
Next 550 kilowatt-hours a month.....	27.50	2.20
Total (1,400 kilowatt-hours a month).....	86.10	10.50

You will see that the old rate charged by the power company was 5 cents a kilowatt-hour, as compared to 7½ mills under the T. V. A. rate. The T. V. A. opened up to the American people the possibility and practicability of rural electrification and the feasibility of the Government participating in this great enterprise. During the last 5 years the Federal Government has made loans available for R. E. A. purposes in the amount of about \$250,000,000. This fund has carried electrical current to some 2,000,000 farm families, or approximately 25 percent of all farms in our country. The R. E. A. has constructed about 200,000 miles of line and the number of patrons on these miles is rapidly increasing as the farm families understand and appreciate more the luxury and the comfort of having electrical current.

In Florida we have a cosmopolitan citizenship with diversified interests. On this account we have not realized as great



benefits from R. E. A. as we should have. Our State has not taken advantage of rural electrification in the same proportion as some other States have. However, Florida has received from the R. E. A. \$1,834,000, which has been used in the construction of 2,002 miles to serve 5,264 families. We have extension applications now pending and it is expected that they will receive allotments in due course of time. We also have additional new projects which are in the process of preparation and development.

One of the about twenty R. E. A. generating plants in the country is located in the Second Congressional District within 10 miles of Starke, my home town. It was necessary for the farmers to get money from the Government to build this plant because the local power companies did not cooperate for cheap wholesale prices for electric current. This plant stands out as a service monument to the present Democratic administration. The R. E. A. thought enough of this marvelous establishment to give special mention to it in the 1939 annual report. It is a modern, up-to-date Diesel-motor generating plant. From this plant service goes out to consumers in 6 to 8 counties. The rapid increase in patrons will in all probability in the near future require plant enlargement. Last fall this modern farm-owned electric plant was dedicated with a public barbecue and the gathering of thousands of people from many counties.

In the Suwannee River Valley, the Suwannee Valley Electric Association has recently opened up 151 miles and is serving 300 to 400 patrons. Of the 15 rural counties in my congressional district, 10 or 11 have rural electrification. I shall not cease my efforts until electrical current is offered to every farm desiring it within my district. No other agency of the Government is carrying real benefit to farmers comparable with rural electrification.

There are some 16,000 farmers' electrical cooperatives in the United States which with Federal funds have constructed enough power lines to reach around the earth 3 times. This service should and will continue as an economic measure until practically all farms in the United States have been given electrical current. The older countries of the world have long realized the economy and benefit of having electrical current on farms. In France and Germany 90 percent of the farm homes have electricity. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, and other old nations of Europe, have electrical current supplied to more than 90 percent of the farms. Conservation and economy have taught these older nations that rural electrification is not only a comfort but is also a business asset to any farm.

In many homes—in fact, in the majority of them—in the Tennessee Valley area, where current can be produced cheaply, they are using electricity even for heating purposes. It has been found in these places that electricity for heating the entire house costs less than wood or coal. For instance, here is the story of one Mississippi home in the T. V. A. area: 37 lights in the house, together with electric iron, refrigerator, range cooking stove, grill, three fans, vacuum cleaner, waffle iron, and six electric heating units—heaters. During the month of January, which is the coldest month, this home used 1,036 kilowatt-hours of electricity, which cost \$9.04. Another housewife in this same area, without home heating appliances, in the month of March used lights in her home and garage, a radio, electric refrigerator, electric iron, electric cooking stove, a vacuum cleaner, a hot-water heater—82 kilowatt-hours of electricity, which cost \$2.14 for the month. March is a comparatively cold month in that area. Of course, the rate is cheaper in the T. V. A. area than we can immediately expect in areas with less production and less consumption. In other words, they have the hydroelectric dams constructed there and the 7½ mills per kilowatt-hour is quite reasonable; however, this 7½ mills per kilowatt-hour, it has been figured, takes into consideration and provides for the retirement of the cost of building lines and also the amortization of the cost of dam construction.

There are hundreds of watersheds throughout the United States which are capable of developing and producing enormous quantities of electrical current. The Congress now has under consideration legislation which would utilize, by

and for the Government, the water-power possibilities of these various streams. The power possibilities of these streams is Nature's gift to the American people. It is a crying shame for this potential power to go to waste in the oceans adjacent to our country for the lack of dams and machinery to harness it. In my own district we have one or more streams capable of the development of considerable water power; of course, not the volume as generated on the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers, but of adequate possibilities to take care of every farm in the State of Florida. Among these rivers is the historic and majestic Suwannee River. The Army engineers, by act of Congress, are now making survey to determine the advisability of flood control and power development in the Suwannee River Valley. It is earnestly hoped by the citizens of their area that favorable findings will be recommended to the Congress for a hydroelectric dam on the Suwannee River to supply cheap hydroelectric current through R. E. A. to all of this adjoining area. This development would give power rates in comparison with those now enjoyed in the Tennessee Valley area. Until this is accomplished we may confidently expect expansion in all parts of the district of rural-electrification current from the existing Diesel-engine power plant at Keystone Heights and of power from power-company lines at wholesale rates.

I remember very well farm homes in my district before our farmers had rural electrification. I have seen the housewife go about the drudgery and duties of her home in all of its toil and physical pain. On washday, for instance, she must draw the water with a hand pole or long chain with a big bucket, carry it several yards to a big black pot and large tubs, or the big, long old-time washing trough, rub and scrub the family clothes for 2 or 3 hours, then place them on the end of the trough or on a block and take a stick weighing several pounds and beat them until the buttons fly off; then throw them in the old black pot with a tarry fire blazing up around it on a hot summer day, stir them, push them down until they are bleached; then, by hand, take the scalding garments from the pot, rinse and rinse and rinse them, and hang them up to dry, then from 12 until 1 o'clock, while she is resting, she must cook a big dinner on a red-hot stove for a large family, clean up the little children, and feed them; then, in a steaming-hot kitchen, wash up the dishes; then go to finish the washing, or scrub, by hand, the kitchen floor. The next day—practically all day—with her irons before a blazing fire, shut up in a hot house, she irons and irons until the garments are pressed and ready for the use of the family. In the kitchen an ice box unknown. Things left over from the meal, also milk and eggs, spoil because it is too hot in the kitchen. The supper is cooked by a small kerosene lamp. After supper has been served, the small school children study their lessons by a pine-knot fire or a small smoke-shaded kerosene lamp.

I will not go into the details of the drudgery of the farmer himself in watering his stock, shelling his corn by hand, blundering around in the barn with no light, and various other necessary endeavors on a dark farm.

The picture is quite different now. In two to three thousand homes in my congressional district the washing machine, the electric iron, the electric fan, the Frigidaire, the electric light, the electric pump, the vacuum cleaner, and other devices have taken the drudgery off their tired and honest backs, while the radio has given them joy and comfort in living. The trend now is not from the farm home to the city for these comforts and luxuries, but is from the city back to the farm to enjoy more of Nature's blessings and invention's comforts. The farmers of my district are living in the dawn of a new day of farm enjoyment and comfort.

On February 2, 1940, the Suwannee Democrat, edited by Hon. Charles Helfenstein, a Harvard man, which is one of the best weekly newspapers in the United States, had the following to say:

FARM HOMES GET ELECTRIC POWER AS R. E. A. ENERGIZES—FIRST SECTION COOPERATIVE COMPLETED—OTHER SECTIONS AS HOMES ARE WIRED

Electric lights burned in many Suwannee County farm homes last night as the local electric cooperative began energizing its lines in this and Lafayette Counties. Thursday afternoon shortly after 2 o'clock electric power coursed through the high-tensioned lines of

the Suwannee Valley Electric Cooperative Association to serve farm homes in the McAlpin, Pinemount, O'Brien, Beulah, and Central communities of this county.

Engineers of the Rural Electrification Administration were here to assist in and witness the cutting in of the cooperative lines to the high-power lines which will provide the current. Approximately 70 homes in the areas mentioned are being serviced at present.

Plans for a rural-electrification line in this county were started nearly 3 years ago. With the assistance of Congressman R. A. GREEN, who has secured two of the four R. E. A. projects in Florida for his district, an appropriation was secured to construct the lines here.

The project manager of the Suwannee Valley Electric Association also recently conveyed the expressions of this association, as follows:

SUWANNEE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.

March 12, 1940.

HON. LEX GREEN,  
Member of Congress,  
Starke, Fla.

DEAR SIR: I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my high regard for your effort toward the advancement of rural electrification in Florida. I sincerely believe I express the thoughts of the majority of, if not all, our cooperative members.

Your continued efforts in behalf of the wonderful program of "electricity on the farm" cannot help but be appreciated by the thousands of farmers throughout the State.

Very respectfully yours,

GEORGE CARVER,  
Project Manager.

And to give a further picture of the appreciation and approval of rural electrification in my district I quote from a news story recently released by Mrs. Grace Warren, home demonstration agent of Alachua County, Fla., as follows:

ELECTRIC POWER BRINGS THRILL TO RURAL HOME FOLKS, STORY REVEALS

The thrill that rural people experience when electricity is turned on in their homes for the first time is well brought out in a story from Mrs. Grace Warren, Alachua County home-demonstration agent.

Mrs. Warren was making her regular round of visits to Alachua County rural homes when she dropped in to have a chat with a woman whose house had received electric power only a short time ago. With a great deal of enthusiasm, the woman said to the agent:

"We had our home wired for some time. It was Saturday afternoon, and then night came. There were no lights, even though we had the switch turned on.

"While my husband and I ate our supper by lamplight suddenly the whole house was lit up like day. We jumped from the table so excited we couldn't finish our supper, and we were having fresh backbone and rice, too. With my new percolator, waffle iron, and hot plate on the table where I can fix a meal without getting up, I honestly feel like I am in a new world. With my electric mixer I beat up a cake in the time I ordinarily would have taken to cream the butter.

"Now my husband and I feel that we can take time to do some of the things we've planned to do but never had time before."

New River, Bradford County, Fla., is the scene of my childhood days. This community had R. E. A. line extended through and from the farm-owned plant at Keystone Heights but owing to congestion of duties the management had been unable to get current turned on in this community. Last December, as the Christmas holidays approached, my boyhood friends and neighbors became anxious to have light during the holiday season. Through the special cooperation of the R. E. A. Administrator in Washington we were able to get the line energized on December 19. I read the following from the county agent of Bradford County, indicating their appreciation and cooperativeness:

STARKE, FLA., December 21, 1939.

HON. R. A. (LEX) GREEN,  
Starke, Fla.

DEAR LEX: On behalf of the 68 farmers who are members of the Clay Electric Cooperative of the Rural Electrification Administration on the New River extension, I wish to express the deepest appreciation for the aid you gave us in getting our New River line energized. The line was energized at 11 o'clock, Tuesday, December 19.

I visited about a dozen of the homes that night, and it was indeed a pleasure to see the enjoyment they received from the energization of the line. They are overjoyed at the prospects of lights for Christmas. They are indeed grateful to you for your cooperation in helping to get the line energized.

With the very best of holiday wishes, I am  
Very truly yours,

T. K. McCLANE, Jr.,  
County Agent.

During this Christmas holiday, my heart was made to rejoice in knowing that I had been helpful to the men and women with whom I had been reared, in making them happy and in making their Christmas bright and joyous. Of all times of the year, the Christmas season is the one most worthy of joy and happiness, and, although this accomplishment is small in a way, it gives me more happiness than practically any other accomplishment of my life.

Rural Electrification Administration officials cooperate thoroughly with farmers desiring to borrow money for the establishment of R. E. A. service. The following is a statement from one of the R. E. A. officials:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, February 28, 1940.

The Honorable LEX GREEN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: I am enclosing an interesting tabulation of information about the Florida R. E. A. projects. I cannot help noticing the large number of areas in your district that have been served already by our projects. If anyone accuses us of favoritism, we shall, of course, have to explain that your great activity and interest in this project made you first on the scene.

You are represented, in part, in five out of our eight existing projects, and the first cooperative project developed in Florida was in your district. I understand that another project is now brewing in Baker County.

You are one of those Congressmen working with and instructing their constituents in such a manner that the Federal agencies are able to serve the people.

Yours very sincerely,

BOYD FISHER,  
Special Assistant to the Administrator, in Charge of State Relations.

Now, my friends, I think you will agree with me that no other branch of the Government is really carrying to the farmers of our Nation equal joy, contentment, and comfort as that carried by the Rural Electrification Administration. The farmers of our Nation deserve so much and receive so little. My effort will go forth until rural electrification is offered to every farm home in the country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have within only a very few minutes glanced through the report of the committee having the bill in charge. My excuse for speaking a few words at this time is that I am a member of the Committee on the Library. I wish to commend the action of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in making the very thorough study they have of the Library of Congress.

The name, Committee on the Library, is somewhat of a misnomer. It is a very honorable and interesting committee to serve on, but as a matter of fact, as far as I have been able to discover after several years of service on it, we have practically nothing to do with the Library itself. Of course, the fact that a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has to do with the appropriations is probably the reason that all the affairs of the Library are in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations.

It seems to me there could well be a change in the rule or a change in the procedure. The Committee on Appropriations is an extremely busy committee. While it devotes attention to these various functions of government, nevertheless it does seem to me that such a committee as the one of which I speak as having the honor of being a member of ought to have rather more to do with the actual management and carrying on of such a great institution as the Library of Congress.

This happens to be a changing time in the Library in that for some forty-odd years we have been fortunate in having the distinguished services of Dr. Herbert Putnam as Librarian. I recall when he came to Washington from Massachusetts. It was a great loss to our State to have him called to this wonderful position here in Washington. Dr. Putnam was a great factor in building up the present Library, and he fortunately has had the cooperation of Congress. There has never been a time, as far as I have known in my service here, that the Congress and the Librarian have not acted in harmony.



The Library of Congress, it seems to me, is one of the institutions where civil service should not be a determining factor in employment. Library work requires special training. To be a competent aid in a library you must have had special training, and that should be determinative rather than the function of a civil-service examination.

I am very glad to say that there has not been at any period under Dr. Putnam, as far as I have known, any political influence or any political effort made with him. If it was made, of course, it was unsuccessful. The Library has been marvelously conducted under him.

As I have said, this is a changing period in the Library in that we have a new Librarian. There was a good deal of surprise last summer when the President appointed Mr. Archibald MacLeish as Librarian, because the friends of Mr. MacLeish, I believe, would not have claimed he had any experience along the line of an actual librarian's work. However, he did bring to the position a splendid background of education and literary training. He is a distinguished author and a graduate of Yale University and other educational institutions. In the brief period he has been Librarian the changes which he seems to want to inaugurate will certainly add to the efficiency of the service rendered by the Library.

I note that on page 10 of the hearings appears this statement about the services of Mr. MacLeish:

It is proper that the committee should frankly state its pleasure at the industrious and intelligent manner in which Mr. MacLeish has entered upon his duties. In the short time he has acquired an amazing intimacy with the functions of the Library and the details of its operation.

Certainly, in view of the study the Subcommittee on Appropriations made, that is a very high compliment for him to pay to Mr. MacLeish, and one richly deserved by him.

It has not been my privilege to have studied the Library in as much detail as I should have done, perhaps, nor to have made use of it as much as I should, but I do believe that there is a purpose and an intention on the part of Mr. MacLeish and his subordinates to cooperate with the Members of the Congress in aiding us in our work and in the research we ourselves do not have the time to do. By inquiring of the Library, we can secure anything within the facilities of the Library. I do commend to the committee and to the House a more extended knowledge of what a marvelous institution we have in the Library of Congress. I am quite certain that a great many Members of the House are not familiar with the details that go to make up this great Library and the opportunities it affords Members of Congress to familiarize themselves with the work the Library is undertaking, and to secure the aid so necessary in carrying on our work. Not only is it the intention of Mr. MacLeish to have that service perfected for us but, as we cooperate with our constituents, an interview with Mr. MacLeish or some of his assistants will show that the libraries throughout the country can have the benefit of the services of the Library of Congress, under proper restrictions.

The other day I visited the new Library of Congress Annex and was very much interested in going through that building to find that nearly 200 rooms are set apart for students who wish to come there and consult references in the Library and be by themselves. These are air-conditioned rooms, where the students can carry on their studies in quiet and silence.

Not only do I commend the Library service and the opportunity that Congress has to use this service, but I commend most particularly to your consideration the Librarian himself and his desire to cooperate with you in the use of his services and the services of those under him as well as the facilities of this world-famous Library.

May I add this one word, Mr. Chairman. I note there is quite a large addition to the appropriation. I believe it is highly justified. I am one of those looking for economy in government, but I do not believe we should begin economizing on the Library of Congress. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, we have of late been apprised of the fact that there has been a composed peace between Russia and Finland.

I hope the proposed treaty between Finland and Russia is not just another scrap of paper. I hope it is not another Munich. The democracies of the world, through their blind appeasement program and failure to extend the necessary aid to Finland in her hour of need, have lost considerable ground against the onrush of godless totalitarianism. No matter what territory Russia may gain from Finland, it will never Russianize her. Finland has remained Finland throughout the centuries. She will rise again with pride and in the end be victorious. She has carved a niche in the hall of nations that stamps her as a people of courage and integrity. In the eyes of the world Finland is still the symbol of honesty and integrity; a Christian democracy whose people will never bow to communism in fact.

Friends of Finland should realize that continued aid is necessary so that this brave people may carry on in the interest of freedom. In fact, we should double our efforts in extending aid to her. I hope that my bill for the return of the interest on Finland's debt will be brought to the House floor and passed immediately. Courage and valor cannot be crushed. The people of Finland cannot be crushed. Their love of freedom, progress, and culture will march on, and it is our duty to continue help that she may rehabilitate herself after her valiant stand against overwhelming odds. She has gained a prominent place in the family of nations, where she will remain with pride. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering the bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941. There are two items in this bill that I desire to call to the attention of the House, one of which is for telegraph and telephone services for Members of the House, amounting to \$130,000. I am informed that about \$100,000 of this is for the payment of telegraph tolls. In the Senate section of the bill there is a somewhat similar provision, and I am informed that about \$100,000 is spent annually by the Senators in telegraph tolls, making a total telegraph bill of approximately \$200,000 annually.

On October 17 of last year I introduced a bill in the House providing for an amendment of the statute that authorizes franking by the President, the Vice President, and the Members of the Congress. My proposed amendment to that statute reads as follows:

A bill granting to the Vice President and Members of Congress the privilege of franking official correspondence not exceeding 1 ounce in weight by air mail.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes," approved April 28, 1904, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Where such official mail matter or correspondence does not exceed 1 ounce in weight, such franking privilege shall include the use of the air mail."

I believe this bill is in the interest of economy. We have a very splendid air service covering all sections of our country. Even between here and my home on the Pacific coast, I can air-mail a letter and get an air-mail letter in reply almost as quickly as I can send out a night letter by telegraph and get a night letter in reply. My point is, that by the enactment of my bill Members will be encouraged to use the air mail, there will be less use of the telegraph franking privilege, and there will be savings amounting to thousands and thousands of dollars annually to the Government.

My bill was referred to the Post Office Department, and under date of March 7 of this year, Mr. Ambrose O'Connell, Acting Postmaster General—and I understand Mr. O'Connell is Second Assistant Postmaster General—wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, reporting adversely on the measure, on the ground that it would be an additional cost. However, Mr. O'Connell, I am sure, did not take into consideration the savings that would be made by reason of substituting the air mail for the telegraph. I was not privileged to discuss this bill with him before he made his report, but I am going to do so in the hope that he may amend this letter that he

has written to the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. I am sure he will agree with me that this bill will save money for the Government.

I believe this is a meritorious bill, and while it is true it would entail some additional cost and burden on the Post Office Department, there would be a decided saving, so far as the Treasury of the United States is concerned. After all, the money comes out of the same purse, and if we can save far more than we are spending, we should not hesitate to enact this bill into law.

The letter received from the Post Office Department, in reference to my bill, is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1940.

HON. MILTON A. ROMJUE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ROMJUE: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 19, 1940, requesting a report upon H. R. 7588, a bill granting to the Vice President and Members of Congress the privilege of franking official correspondence not exceeding 1 ounce in weight by air mail. This bill proposes to grant to the Vice President and Members of Congress the privilege of franking official correspondence not exceeding 1 ounce in weight by air mail.

Section 327 of title 39, United States Code, provides that the Vice President, Members and Members-elect of, Delegates and Delegates-elect to Congress, and the Resident Commissioners from Puerto Rico and the Philippines shall have the privilege of sending free through the mails, and under this frank, any mail matter to any Government official or to any person, correspondence not exceeding 4 ounces in weight, upon official or departmental business.

By authority of section 321 of title 39, United States Code, as amended, the departments and independent agencies of the Government use the mails under the penalty privilege without the payment of postage where such use is exclusively on official business. If the present law were amended to grant the use of air mail without the payment of postage by the Vice President and Members of Congress, there would be, perhaps, quite a substantial number of requests at once for extending the penalty privilege to the departments and independent agencies of the Government in the use of the air mail. Many governmental departments have been urging the granting of this privilege for a considerable length of time.

When the air mail was originally established there was in mind the fostering of aviation, and it was recognized that to promote aviation through the establishment of air-mail service, a subsidy must be allowed. The postage on an ordinary letter for nonlocal delivery is 3 cents, while the postage for air mail is 6 cents. Authority for the use of air mail by Members of Congress and governmental departments would no doubt result immediately in applications for higher mail-carriage rates to carriers and agitate a demand for the reduction of the air-mail postage.

The Department does not feel that this privilege should be extended until such time as the revenues from the air-mail service approximate the cost for this service. No doubt, when that time comes, or when it can be shown that the air-mail service is operated at a profit, consideration can be given to what is proposed in this bill, as well as to a reduction in the rate for air mail.

Any appreciable increase in the volume of mail carried by the air lines would be likely to result in increased pay allowances to the carriers by the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The revenues derived from the air-mail postage, the revenues derived by the carriers through express and passenger traffic, and the volume of mail all have a bearing upon the rates fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the carriers.

In view of the foregoing, the Department does not believe that favorable consideration should be given to a bill of this character at this time.

It has been ascertained from the Bureau of the Budget that this report is in accord with the program of the President.

Very truly yours,  
AMBROSE O'CONNELL,  
Acting Postmaster General, Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. First, I congratulate the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the work they have done on this bill. Every member worked hard and we also had one member of the Committee on Appropriations, not assigned to this committee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who did valuable work. To the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], I offer congratulations. He displayed business judgment and ability in everything he did in handling the hearings, and I have not seen anything like it on any appropriation committee for several years.

Notwithstanding the fact that this appropriation has increased \$626,301 over and above the appropriation of last year, the law creating additional secretaries had a great deal to do with that. We increased the clerk hire, and all but

12 Members of Congress took out the total amount allowed for clerk hire, with the exception of a number of Members who increased the clerks in their offices and still had something remaining, not using the whole sum total allowed by the Congress.

As to the item we have discussed here today of \$350,000 for repair of the terrace, sometimes I have questioned whether we ought to go ahead at this time and spend that money. Yet there has been much speculation as to the fact that the Capitol ought to be kept in good shape because it is really the Capitol of the country, and for that reason I went along with the committee on that item. It certainly is a needed expense, if not now, some future time.

The expenses for the running of the Senate are included in this bill. There are 96 Senators. We have allowed them in the bill \$3,856,464. We have 435 Members of the House, and the total sum allowed for the membership of the House and all of the expenses incurred by the membership of the House is \$9,115,488. In other words, we have more than four times as many Members of the House as in the Senate, and yet the Senate appropriation is about 50 percent as large as that of the House, and we are supposed not to have anything to say with reference to the expenditures of the United States Senate. I call that to the attention of the Members as food for thought, and especially to the Senate itself.

We added to the amount for the Library of Congress \$100,000 for binding new volumes. We have increased the size of the Library almost 100 percent. That increase in size is going to require permission to file a great number of volumes that are still uncharted, as we say. We have added \$100,000 in this bill to get many books in shape so that when they put them in the new Library they will be preserved.

Next, there is the item of \$135,000 which was left off from the congressional allotment of appropriations in 1939 but has been restored this year. The chairman of the committee in charge of this bill has not made any proposition to giving the Joint Committee on Printing an opportunity to go ahead, and make this saving, if they see fit, by adopting a new regulation so that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be printed in three columns instead of two, as now published, and as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, I am sure we ought to take advantage of the present suggestion by the Public Printer, and as was stated by the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], that saving should have gone into effect a year ago. I am in hopes that the Joint Committee on Printing will take advantage of this proposed change in the style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Notwithstanding the fact that this bill carries \$23,907,744, we cut the amount of the Budget \$1,177,868. If I had the running of this myself, I think I could cut it down a whole lot more—no mistake about that. Lots of things go on on Capitol Hill where we could practice economy, but when we think of the total amount that the Senate and the House use, in an appropriation of almost \$24,000,000, and that the Congress will appropriate for one battleship from \$90,000,000 to \$115,000,000, and when we think of the amount of the appropriations we have already made this year, I question whether the Appropriations Committee and the membership of the House should not economize more in the appropriations for the other departments of Government. The appropriations that have been made this year, including the amount that the Senate put on the agricultural appropriation bill of \$208,968,584, amounts now to \$5,480,146,435. That also includes the authorization that we made yesterday of \$660,000,000 for the increase of the Navy. If the House appropriates that money, then we have not saved very much money up to this time this year, because the total appropriations for the same bills last year amounted to \$5,835,049,962. We still have to get the Army appropriation bill. The bill which we are now considering for the legislative establishment increases the amount by \$626,301 over the last year's appropriation. We have yet to come to the District of Columbia appropriation and the relief appropriation bill



which I understand the President has sent to the Committee on Appropriations for study and which amounts now to about \$1,100,000,000.

So you can see that with the total receipts last year, 1939, of the Federal Government, \$5,667,823,625.59, where we are going to be in a year probably two billion more in the red. Again I ask you, where are you going to get the money? [Applause.]

Let me call your attention to the fact that on March 8, since July 1 of last year, we have gone in the red \$2,710,948,685. It is terrible, men, it is awful—what do you say?

Let me call your attention to the fact that on March 10, 1933, the President of the United States made this statement to the House of Representatives and to the Senate:

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

If that was his opinion then why does he not say more now after 10 years of the road to bankruptcy?

He also made this statement:

With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this upon our national economy. It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure. It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed. Our Government's house is not in order, and for many reasons no effective action has been taken to restore it to order.

Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rests the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of our agricultural products, and the availability of employment. The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It therefore becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it.

Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger.

It is too late for a leisurely approach to this problem. We must not wait to act several months hence. The emergency is accentuated by the necessity of meeting great refunding operations this spring.

We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy.

Now, that was 7 years ago. We have been traveling on this road that the President mentioned 3 years previous to that, but since that time the road has become rougher and more rocky and more blocks have been put in front of him every day. Yet he lets it go. He does nothing about it. Why?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

But instead of him trying to cut down on Government expenses and doing the things that he said when he came before the Congress, doing those things which he promised the American people before he took office he would do, please tell me under the name of heaven, where is the President of the United States with his Economy Committee that he had the Congress create in 1933? Where are those economies he is talking about? He has been the most extravagant President we ever had. He is the greatest spender of all history in all the world. There is nobody on the Democratic side of this House who can name one man who has ever approached him in his asking. No one can approach him in his spending. I say to the Congress of the United States when they gave the President of the United States the first \$4,880,000,000 that he asked for, it was the worst thing you ever did to the President of the United States. It was the worst thing you ever did to this Nation of ours. Add to that the \$17,000,000,000 you have given him for the purpose of what he called "relief," and it is worse yet. That money has been squandered and wasted in doing things that were most unsound, illogical, and unjust; building that great national debt up to a point where it is going to be left to our children and our children's children to pay. It could have been one-fourth as much and no one would have suffered.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I would like to yield, but the gentleman can get all the time he wants to defend the President of the United States. I defended him the first 3 months he was in office when he made those statements, but when he started

to go on a spending spree and turning somersault after somersault to get money out of the Members of Congress and the public when they rubber stamped practically every bill he wanted and handed him all the money which he wasted in extravagance, I refuse to follow him further. I am glad of that. I would not be a rubber stamp for any man. Our national debt has been increased each year since Mr. Roosevelt took office. Never near a balance. Just look at the great number of buildings he has put up; the great number of expenditures for expansions in parks and nonessentials, things that will add to the annual national burden. Much of that money actually was squandered and wasted.

Now, gentlemen, I hope that when it comes to the relief money that they will ask for this year the Members will vote for relief to be sent back to the States in direct proportion to their needs, but let the people back home raise part of the money and help defray the cost of Government and not try to get it all out of the Federal Treasury, just because they think it is easy picking. The Treasury of the United States, from which they have been getting this money, is certainly empty now. You have about reached the national debt limit. So let us try to economize and try to be thrifty. "Have thrift" as our watchword, and not squander and spend, spend, spend.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Does not the gentleman know that the sponsors in the present program must contribute 25 percent now?

Mr. RICH. If you will get relief out of politics and put it on merit, instead of letting the Federal Government try to take care of the needs of all the people of this country, we will get somewhere. Let the Federal Government furnish its part of the money, and let the legislatures have some responsibility. Let the local communities have some responsibility. They think it is not costing them anything, and you are only fooling the people. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDELSTEIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, March 18 is the anniversary of the birthday of Dr. William I. Sirovich, who, until he passed away last December, so ably represented the Fourteenth District of New York in this House for 13 years. As his successor in office, it is my privilege and responsibility to carry on along the path Dr. Sirovich blazed. In honor of his memory and to commemorate his birth, it is only fitting to present to you the entire career of this gifted personality, who, only a brief few months ago, was in the land of the living, strenuously engaged in serving his God, his country, and his community. His untimely and unexpected death 2 weeks before the beginning of the present session deprived the people of that district of one who had distinguished himself by his self-sacrificing work for democracy and humanity.

The span of his 58 years is a chronicle of the opportunities offered by democracy. Dr. Sirovich accepted them, used them, and repaid them a hundredfold, by strengthening our democracy, by creating opportunities for the oppressed, the underprivileged, and the persecuted. His activities in behalf of the public welfare were confined to no one field. He was not a physician in the narrow sense only. His task was to apply himself, under the oath of Hippocrates, to the entire field of human endeavor. The practically unlimited scope of his interests did not mean that his numerous talents were spread too thinly, for he was no "jack of all trades and master of none." Unfortunately, the driving energy which underlay all his work wore out the physical structure too soon, while his mind was still in its full vigor. He warned his colleagues of this danger but failed to heed his own good advice.

Except for the first few years in the city of his birth, York, Pa., he spent his entire life on the East Side of New York City. There he was reared and educated, and there he began his efforts to improve the lot of the poor and the needy. His early education, including a bachelor of arts degree from the College of the City of New York in 1902,

he obtained because of democracy's belief in public education. His subsequent formal education—for he never ceased his studies—he obtained through his own endeavors. He taught in the city's public schools, and with this money he attended Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons. In 1906, he received his degrees both as a doctor of medicine and as a master of arts.

For two decades, until he was elected a Member of the Seventieth Congress, he devoted himself to public service, rewarded only by the high esteem of his entire community, and often furthering such work with his own funds. Three Governors and three mayors appointed Dr. Sirovich to public posts. For 20 years he was a member and chairman of his local school board. He successfully appeared before the legislature to urge improved salary laws for teachers.

As a member of the State Commission on Widows' Pensions, he toured the United States at his own expense to study the methods of other States in handling this problem. He used his studies in writing the State's present Child-Welfare Law. As vice president of the Board of Child Welfare, he inaugurated a complete health service for orphans under its jurisdiction. He also was a member of the State charities committee, State Hospital Commission, and the State Prison Commission. It was he who fostered the establishment of vocational education in the State's prison system.

Even then, Dr. Sirovich knew the need of a fair deal between capital and labor. In those days he realized that the balance against labor needed redressing. He appeared before the State legislature to urge the adoption of an adequate employers' liability law, and again in support of workmen's compensation. His judicial temperament, which could decide on the facts and not on his acknowledged sympathy for labor, as well as his acquaintance with the industry's technique made him invaluable as impartial arbitrator between the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and the Manufacturers' Association. He served in that arduous post for 2 years before the press of duties called him elsewhere. In that time he handed down many decisions on the controversies which still vex that industry. His calm and soothing manner, his willingness to listen patiently until each side had fully presented its case, his suggestions of reasonable compromises, his fair decision where both sides could not agree, earned him the approbation of all in the industry.

Dr. Sirovich's father was a Rabbi, and his son was reared in the Hebraic faith. In his manhood, he did not desert that creed, and he gave of his strength to it. When the civilized world was horrified by the government-instigated pogroms of Russia's "Black Hundreds," he was one of the four leading spirits who organized the American Citizens Committee to abrogate the Russo-American Treaty. He persevered in that task until that treaty was denounced by our Government. His faith was not based on a rigid sectarianism, however. He freely gave of his goodness and energy to all individuals who called to him for succor, irrespective of their race, creed, or color.

As an educator, Dr. Sirovich firmly believed in adult education. Throughout his life, he did not cease to educate himself, although he held three degrees from institutions of higher learning. To aid others he wrote for newspapers and periodicals and he lectured for the Board of Education at Cooper Union, Carnegie Hall, and the Metropolitan Opera House.

All this time Dr. Sirovich practiced medicine among those in need and distress in the community in which he had been raised. A great deal of his service was rendered without remuneration. Conditions among the immigrants strongly impressed him with the need of medical welfare and Americanization work in their behalf. To see the need was to fulfill it. He intervened in many cases to prevent unjust deportations in cases of hardship.

His recognized talent as a diagnostician and surgeon led to his election to the American College of Physicians and Surgeons. For 20 years he served, again without compensation, except the reward of a job well done, as Superintendent of Peoples' Hospital. His forceful administration and keen executive ability revitalized the hospital.

For 20 years, with courage, vision, ability, and energy, Dr. Sirovich had served his community in many ways, all without thought of compensation. In 1926 the Fourteenth New York Congressional District chose him as its Representative in the Seventieth Congress. So well did he do his work that it reelected him to each succeeding Congress, including this one, with ever-increasing majorities.

As a Member of this honorable body, he regarded himself as the guardian of a public trust, requiring ever new and greater effort on his part. He brought to bear on his congressional duties those same qualities which had made him a faithful public servant before. As always, he represented the underprivileged and the oppressed, "those who were not able to help themselves."

The first bill he introduced as a Congressman was one to provide for old-age pensions. He also fought for unemployment insurance and child welfare. These bills were in advance of their time, and then, unlike now, lacked popular support. In a Republican-controlled House they were foredoomed to a silent death in committee. However, the indomitable heart and mind of Dr. Sirovich did not surrender to defeat so easily. Today the measures for which he fought so valiantly are part of the New Deal embodied in the various titles of the Social Security Act.

The major part of Dr. Sirovich's district consisted, and, much to his regret and mine, still contains inadequate housing facilities. The Wagner Housing Act of 1937 was considered by him to be a brave start along the right road. He took an active part to secure consideration, at the first session of this Congress, of amendments intended to increase the lending limits of the Housing Authority.

His statesmanship was not limited by the territorial boundaries of his district. When the *Morro Castle* disaster shocked the Nation, Dr. Sirovich, like other leaders in Congress, could not tolerate such wanton waste of lives. As ranking member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he took an active part in the ensuing hearings. His vigorous tenacity obtained the enactment of a modernized safety-at-sea code to make repetition of such a sea disaster impossible. Although none of his constituents "went down to the sea in ships," he took an active interest in the working conditions of seamen. One of the last measures he introduced was to provide an unemployment insurance system for them. To him it mattered not whether the problem affected his district or the Nation as a whole. His breadth of vision enlisted his aid for all causes of benefit to the Nation.

As a writer, he early became aware of the problems of those who lived on their literary and musical creations. As chairman of the Committee on Patents and Copyrights, he did much to aid them. He believed that the Government could and should aid artists. He introduced, at each session, a bill to establish a Department of Fine Arts, so that this country might approach, as well as it could "the glory that was Greece." The various arts projects of the W. P. A. were in no small measure derived from his efforts, and he strongly opposed their hamstringing in the last relief bill.

Dr. Sirovich was a firm believer in a strong civil-service system as the best means of dispatching public business efficiently, and promoting democracy. He understood the problems of Federal employees, and he fought for the recognition of their just claims.

His circle of friends was a symbol of his personality. His talent for friendship won him admirers in all walks of life. "Friend" was no empty word to him. To those to whom he gave that meaningful title he gave unswerving loyalty. His last words on the floor of this House just before the adjournment of the special session were in defense of a friend. Typically, he charged to the attack by saying:

It takes a lifetime for a man to build up an honorable character. It takes but a moment to destroy it.

He was an ardent admirer and close friend of President Roosevelt. As such he was a true Democrat and a staunch new dealer. He abhorred pretense and sham and outspokenly opposed dictatorship and religious and racial oppression. His knowledge of these hateful symptoms of a world



in turmoil was gained at first hand from his travels in Europe and Asia.

I know this to be but a brief and inadequate summary of the career of a great man whose entire life was devoted to public service without thought of personal aggrandizement. He was a bachelor and, although he bestowed a full measure of love on his sisters and their children, he was the devoted "stepfather of 40,000 orphans." Democracy's advantages had made him a man. His use of those opportunities more than repaid that democracy. His distinguished public services, long recognized, were rewarded by the receipt of an alumni public-service medal from his alma mater.

The Lord has called Dr. Sirovich from our midst. His unflagging zeal, his determination to finish the tasks ahead, his untiring mental energy no longer aid us in realizing the objectives we seek to accomplish. Although there are others to carry on, his passing will long be mourned. Of him it can well be said:

To live in hearts we leave behind  
Is not to die.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read through line 20, on page 11, the first portion dealing with the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think we should read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks and messengers to the following committees: Agriculture and Forestry—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Appropriations—clerk, \$7,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk, \$4,800; assistant clerk, \$3,900; three assistant clerks at \$3,000 each; two assistant clerks at \$2,220 each; messenger, \$1,800. To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Civil Service—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Claims—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; two assistant clerks, at \$2,220 each. Commerce—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,400; two assistant clerks, at \$2,220 each. Conference Majority of the Senate—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; two assistant clerks at \$2,580 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Conference Minority of the Senate—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; two assistant clerks at \$2,580 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220. District of Columbia—clerk, \$3,900; two assistant clerks at \$2,880 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Education and Labor—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Expenditures in the Executive Departments—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Finance—clerk, \$4,200; special assistant to the committee, \$3,600; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,700; assistant clerk, \$2,400; two assistant clerks at \$2,220 each; two experts (one for majority and one for the minority) at \$3,600 each; messenger, \$1,800. Foreign Relations—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880 and \$500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,800. Immigration—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$3,600, and \$1,400 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Inter-oceanic Canals—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Interstate Commerce—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$3,600; assistant clerk, \$2,880; two assistant clerks at \$2,580 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; two additional clerks at \$1,800 each. Judiciary—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; two assistant clerks at \$2,580 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Library—clerk, \$3,900; two assistant clerks at \$2,400 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Manufactures—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Military Affairs—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,400; two assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; two additional clerks at \$1,800 each. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,400; two assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Patents—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk,

\$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Pensions—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; four assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; four assistant clerks at \$2,220 each; additional clerk, \$1,800. Printing—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Privileges and Elections—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Public Lands and Surveys—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; two assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Revision of the Laws—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Rules—clerk, \$3,900 and \$200 toward the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual under the direction of the Committee on Rules; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Territories and Insular Affairs—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; two assistant clerks at \$2,220 each; assistant clerk, \$2,000; additional clerk, \$1,800; in all, \$505,960.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. I notice certain language in various places throughout the bill, on page 2, referring to the Senate, for instance, appears the following:

Chief Clerk, who shall perform the duties of reading clerk, \$5,500, and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; financial clerk, \$5,000, and \$2,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; Parliamentarian, \$5,000, and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

And again, on page 12, referring to the House of Representatives, we find the language:

Parliamentarian, \$5,000, and \$2,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Also \$1,000 for compiling digest of rules, making a total of \$8,500.

I am not criticizing the present incumbent, but in my opinion I think this is a poor way to legislate and would like to know from the chairman of the subcommittee the purpose of this language.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I shall be pleased to answer my colleague from Michigan.

The original sum sets forth the base pay for the office. The additional amount carried is an increase given to the present incumbent of the particular office so long as he holds the office. If language of that sort were not in the bill and the base rate went up, for instance, from \$4,000 to \$5,000, the next incumbent would take the position at \$5,000. The reason for handling it in this manner is to protect the base rates for these positions and to reward people who have served long periods of time or who have performed extraordinary service. It has been done in this way for years and years, long before either of us came to Congress.

Mr. HOOK. Yes; but this is not a question of longevity; it just provides for the position of the present incumbent, does it not?

Mr. RABAUT. To the extent of the additional amount.

Mr. HOOK. All right. It does not pro rate as to number of years; it does not pro rate as to ability; it is based only on the present incumbent.

Mr. RABAUT. It lies within the power and discretion of those who appear to recommend and of the committee to grant these advances, and they are limited just as the language expresses it, to the present incumbents; they get a certain increase. It is a custom that has prevailed for years. I had no indication that the gentleman even had this in contemplation, although he has been sitting next to me all day.

Mr. HOOK. Just a minute. It would apply not only to "the present incumbent" while he continuously holds the office, but also if he came back after a lapse of service.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman refers to the item which in total gives the present incumbent \$7,500, how much is the base?

Mr. HOOK. I am referring to the language "\$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. RABAUT. All right. The base rate for that particular position is \$5,500. This additional amount raises the salary to \$6,500. If he has been here over a period of 5 years, 10

years, or 15 years, in many instances because of additional work heaped upon him or because of some particular qualifications, he may well deserve an increase or promotion, and this is the only way in which it can be done without disturbing the base pay of the position. As I say, this is a custom that has prevailed for many years, and these recommendations are concurred in by both the majority and minority leaders of the House.

Mr. HOOK. That does not apply to every present incumbent now employed in the legislative establishment, but just to certain present incumbents?

Mr. RABAUT. No, it does not; for if the increase were to be given to everybody, there would be no necessity for this specific language.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Let me say this to the gentleman: Those who have been here a long time know that there are certain specialized positions around the Capitol. When a new man comes to those places it takes him a long time to learn the work. Sometimes he is never worth any more than the base salary. Sometimes he does not prove capable enough. Sometimes after 2 or 3 years someone may want to take him out of this employment when he learns it and give him private employment. That is the reason why this provision is in here. In order to hold these very capable, these very highly specialized employees, it is necessary many times to add these additional amounts. It has been done many, many years, and it should be done for the simple reason, let me repeat to the gentleman, that the work of many of these employees is of such a highly technical nature that the House would really be crippled in its operations if their services were lost.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will go back into history he will find that, regardless of what political party is in power, those employees who have received this recognition are held in their same positions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is to be congratulated on inserting this provision in the bill and making it apply to the present incumbents in this case. I know of instances where it has been done in reference to Federal judges sitting in this country; and, as has been stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], chairman of the subcommittee, if this provision were not put in there, then the base pay is increased and the successor of the present incumbent would start at a higher salary. I believe this is a very commendable provision.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the minority employees authorized and named in the House Resolutions numbered 51 and 53 of December 11, 1931, and numbered 281 of July 21, 1937: Two, at \$5,000 each; one, at \$3,000; two, at \$2,820 each; one, at \$3,600; and \$300 additional while the position is held by the present incumbent (minority pair clerk, House Resolution numbered 313 of August 7, 1935); in all, \$22,540.

Mr. SEGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill a question. Who is this \$3,000 for?

Mr. RABAUT. That is for a minority employee, Mr. Griffin.

Mr. SEGER. I thank the gentleman.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Attending physician's office: For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency room and for the attending physician and his assistants, including an allowance of not to exceed \$30 per month each to three assistants as provided by the House resolutions adopted July 1, 1930, and January 20, 1932, \$4,000, of which sum \$500 shall be available immediately.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph beginning on page 22, line 22, and ending on page 23, line 3, on the ground this is not authorized by law. I see by the paragraph that a House resolution adopted on July 1, 1930, and a House resolution of January 20, 1932, are referred to. I have been unable to obtain copies of these resolutions although I have sent to the folding room. I am informed they are not available. I therefore make the point of order that the activities and the things provided for in that paragraph are not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, on page 25 of the Journal of the House of Representatives of December 5, 1928, under the caption, "Medical officer for the House," appears a resolution, adopted by unanimous consent:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby requested to detail a medical officer of the Navy to be in attendance at the Hall of the House of Representatives during the sessions of such House.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. What is the date of that resolution, and is that one of the resolutions referred to in the bill now before us?

Mr. RABAUT. This is dated December 5, 1928, and is the original resolution of authorization for this office. It was presented by Mr. Britten and, as I remember it, Mr. Britten was an outstanding Republican, and chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee at that time. This resolution provides for the detail of a doctor from the Navy to the Hall of the House of Representatives. It is House Resolution 253, of the Seventieth Congress.

Mr. CARTER. What do the resolutions referred to in this bill provide?

Mr. RABAUT. In the Legislative Appropriation Act, approved on June 30, 1932, there is a provision, title I, section 4, listed on page 399 of the Statutes, Seventy-second Congress, side caption "Capitol physician," reading as follows:

The detail of the present incumbent as attending physician at the Capitol shall be continued until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman be so kind as to read the original resolution again—the one of 1928?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. On page 25 of the Journal of the House of Representatives of December 5, 1928:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby requested to detail a medical officer of the Navy to be in attendance at the Hall of the House of Representatives during the sessions of such House.

That is House Resolution No. 253.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard further on the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] want any further resolutions?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I would like to have the ones referred to here.

Mr. RABAUT. Here is one dated July 1, 1930, being House Resolution 271, Seventy-first Congress:

*Resolved*, That until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House an allowance of not to exceed \$30 per month each to the two assistants in the office of the attending physician.

Further substantiating the fact that there is a physician to the House of Representatives.

Here is another resolution, dated January 20, 1932, being House Resolution 111, Seventy-second Congress:

#### ADDITIONAL PHYSICIAN OFFICE ASSISTANTS

*Resolved*, That the number of assistants in the attending physician's office of the House of Representatives shall be increased from two to three and the allowance of \$30 per month for the one additional man shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

This all proves that there is a physician in attendance at the House of Representatives. Therefore, if we have a physician to the House of Representatives, it is in order to provide for the equipment of the office of the physician and the



necessary supplies which are incident to the continuation of that office.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, my contention is that the detailing of a medical officer for the House of Representatives by the Navy Department does not carry with it an authorization to purchase drugs and medicines for the entire membership of the House.

It does not carry with it an authorization for equipment, and it does not carry with it an authorization for contingent expenses or for expenses of the establishment of an emergency room.

I have read the hearings recently held before the subcommittee in reference to the office of the medical officer. The only testimony given there, and it is very brief, covering about one-half of one page, is to the effect that they needed some additional money for the purchase of drugs. The purchase of drugs is a separate and distinct matter from that of rendering medical service and attention. Therefore, I say it was not the intent of the Congress to saddle upon the taxpayers of this country the burden of buying drugs for Members of Congress when the Congress permitted the detailing of a medical officer from the Navy Department.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COSTELLO). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from California makes a point of order against the language contained in the bill, starting at line 22 on page 22 and going down to and including line 3 on page 23. The language of this paragraph provides for the office of the attending physician at the Capitol.

The Chair believes that the gentleman from Michigan has very clearly shown from the citations he has read that the position of attending physician has been definitely established by law. Likewise, the two resolutions referred to in the language in lines 1 and 2 on page 23 definitely authorize the creation of the positions of the three assistants to the attending physician.

The gentleman from California raises a further question regarding the sum of money that may be available for the use of medicines and other equipment in the office of the attending physician. The Chair does not believe there is any question but that whenever the Congress has created an office such act carries with it the right of such office to have the equipment necessary to carry out its work. The organic law that creates a department necessarily implies the authority for the contingent expenses that are incident to the maintenance of that office.

A similar incident occurred on February 13, 1919, and reference to it may be found in section 1273 of volume 7, Cannon's Precedents:

On February 13, 1919, the Army appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, when the Clerk read the following paragraph:

"For contingent expenses of the Military Intelligence Division, General Staff Corps, including the purchase of law books, professional books of reference; subscription to newspapers and periodicals; drafting and messenger service; and of the military attachés at the United States embassies and legations abroad; the cost of special instruction at home and abroad, and in maintenance of students and attachés; and for such other purposes as the Secretary of War may deem proper; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$200,000."

A question was raised as to the propriety of the expenditures, and the Chairman rules:

If a particular Army officer, drawing an Army salary, is assigned to do a particular work, and in connection with that work incurs certain expenses, the Chair cannot see why that is not an appropriate Army expense, to be paid out of the contingent allowance for Army expenses. So far as the Chair has been furnished with any information, it has been of an argumentative character; and, dealing with that, the Chair thinks this is clearly an Army expense, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

In that particular case, when the War Department was authorized to carry on certain functions in connection with military intelligence, it also was proper for the Department to carry on other activities such as educating and training military personnel for such work.

The Chair feel that in this particular instance, where the office of attending physician has been established, the supply-

ing of medicine for the use of the persons calling upon the attending physician for his assistance is a proper expenditure. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order of the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 22, beginning in line 22, strike out all down to and including line 3 on page 23.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I propose to strike out the paragraph relating to the attending physician's office. This amendment does not abolish the office of the attending physician but it does prevent the expenditure of this \$4,000 for medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses, and also takes \$30 per month off the salary of certain attendants there. These persons are already Government employees and are drawing a salary from some other branch of the Government. There is no way, may I say in passing, of telling from this appropriation item how much the office of the attending physician costs, because the attending physician is paid from a different source, his automobile is supplied by funds from a different source, and his assistants are paid from funds from a different source.

Under the ruling the Chair has just made, the taxpayers of this country are required not only to furnish medical attention but anything else the physician may believe necessary and essential in carrying out the duties of his office. This physician would be required to furnish canes, crutches, and wheel chairs, and anything else of that nature.

I for one believe that I should buy my own medicines and pay for them. I do not believe this Congress should shift that burden to the taxpayers of this country. Personally, I believe it is very questionable whether we should have an attending physician here at the expense of the taxpayers. If we want to get a physician at our own expense—and we could do it at a small fraction of the cost of this office if we desired to do it—that is our business, but when we load this cost on the taxpayers of the country I believe we are burdening them unduly.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I would suggest that if the gentleman has such qualms of conscience whenever he sees the House physician in an emergency, he ought to leave \$2 on the desk for him.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for his great contribution.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman has attacked, as I understand, the appropriation for the three enlisted men who are assigned here to this office.

Mr. CARTER. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not know who the men are or anything about that and I have not attacked them. I said that they are drawing a salary from another source.

Mr. WARREN. I did not say the gentleman attacked them, I said he is attacking the appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. There are three enlisted men who are, of course, paid by the Navy and under two House resolutions it was provided that they should receive \$30 a month so long as they were assigned up here. Of course, the gentleman's party established this office and the gentleman's party also assigned two of these three men to this office. The reason that they are paid this \$30 as an allowance is for the meals that they must eat while they are assigned here and for certain civilian clothes that they must purchase during the year or during their assignment here.

Mr. CARTER. I say that if we need assistants there, we should not draft them from the Navy, but we should establish a budget for the physician's office and be frank and fair about it and lay all of the cards on the table right here before the House.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Commenting further on the three enlisted men who are assigned to the physician's office, the base pay of these chief pharmacist mates is \$125 a month. It is true that the Navy allows them subsistence, meals, and quarters, but you will find what they pay the enlisted man for his eats and for his quarters is not adequate to meet the present-day costs, so that \$30 added to the \$125 does not fully compensate the chief pharmacist mates who are assigned to the office of the physician.

Mr. CARTER. I am not saying that this amount is too much, I am saying that whatever it is, the Members of this House should not burden the taxpayers of the country with it. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a distinguished Member of this body, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the late Honorable Martin Madden, was stricken in his office just to our left. I remember the day. There was no physician available, although at the time there were several physicians who were Members of this House. Martin Madden passed away. He was my personal friend, and I admired him. It was stated by several physicians if medical attention could have been secured without delay, Mr. Madden might have been saved. After his death, Hon. Fred Britten, of Illinois, who, I think, up to the time he left this body had served longer on the Republican side than any Member, was responsible for the assignment of a physician to the Capitol. When that physician came here, two enlisted men, classified as pharmacist mates, came with him. One is a chemist; the other had served abroad during the World War, performing duties of a medical officer with a company of marines. He was in several engagements. He has been in the service nearly 30 years, starting at an early age. I would say that he is qualified to act as a physician himself, although, of course, he has never received such a diploma. He has had the practical experience during his long service.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a minute I will yield.

I have a personal interest in this office. It so happens that I was stricken myself 5 years ago, and I went to the office of the physician at half past eleven. I was placed on one of the cots by Dr. Calver. At about quarter after twelve the bells rang for a vote, and I came up here to answer to my name. For nearly 10 years I had never missed a roll call in this House, and I did not want to break that record. The doctor followed me to the floor, and in 10 minutes I was taken to the hospital. I remained on my back for several months and was away from the Capitol for nearly 9 months. Had Dr. Calver not been downstairs, I would not be here today. Immediate attention saved me. Such attention might have saved Martin Madden. I know of a number of Members who have been stricken on the floor who have been given emergency treatment, rushed to the hospital, who are with us today.

We have lost more Members of Congress in the last 13 months than in any similar period in its history. There is a much different situation here today than when I came to Washington nearly 30 years ago. The burden of work upon the Members of this House has increased at least a thousand percent. There is no telling when someone may be taken suddenly ill, and this physician and the men in the office, as well as medicine, are needed. If it is necessary when one goes to the office to go to a drug store to secure a little medicine to cure his ills, the delay might be harmful.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a minute I will be pleased to yield.

I think this physician and his assistants are doing a wonderful service, and I sincerely hope the amendment of the gentleman from California will be voted down.

I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Is the gentleman laboring under the apprehension that my amendment abolishes the office?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not say that the gentleman's amendment abolishes the office.

Mr. CARTER. My amendment does not abolish the office.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know it does not; but if you are going to have the office, why not give the doctor and his assistants the tools with which to do the work? That is what I am speaking for.

Mr. CARTER. Would the gentleman be willing to pay for his own drugs?

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly I can pay for my own medicine, and am willing to do so.

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman not think the membership of the House are financially able to do the same?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; but what if an emergency develops? What does it amount to? Are we to compare the life of one Member of this House with the small amount we are appropriating here?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the drugs are not supplied to all of the Member of Congress, and that ought not to be in the RECORD with any idea that they are supplied to all of the Members of Congress. If the gentlemen think that the small amount of money paid for drugs represents the amount that is to be used by Members of the House, he is very much mistaken. This item is for office help, equipment, and emergency drugs and supplies. That is all that is going out here. In ordinary prescriptions, in the matter of illness, the man can be told what is necessary and where it can be obtained, and if he cannot get it himself the physician will supply it for the Member and he will pay the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct. Medicine has been secured for me, and I paid for it. I paid my hospital bill, of course, as others do.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I heard with a great deal of interest the statement made by the gentleman with reference to his personal experience with the House physician. I say to the gentleman that I had a like experience with the House physician, and if it had not been for the advice and attention of the House physician to myself, like the gentleman from Missouri, I would not be here now.

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, who has had a like experience.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think many Members have had the same experience. As to saying the drugs are being paid for by the Government, I say this: I have received emergency doses there, but I have always had prescriptions filled and paid for them myself, as other Members have.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think that applies to other Members of the House. All large and, in fact, many small business establishments provide rest rooms, nurses, and in some instances physicians. We provide for physicians and equipment for some of our large departments and agencies. If we can do this for the Government employees, provide for them to receive emergency treatment and the medicine to treat them, why not do it for ourselves? No matter how well the taxpayers might not like us, still I do not think they will complain about this small appropriation. I appeal for the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I seldom rise in opposition to an amendment to a bill to save money for the Federal Government, and I do not in this case. I want to be as economical as I can, but if I wanted to cut out money from this bill I think I could find many, many places where I could do it a little easier on my conscience than I could in striking out this particular item. We have here 430 Members of the House and 96 Senators, all of whom have two or three or four or five clerks. This doctor is supposed to administer to the people on the Hill, a popu-



lation of over 1,500, and the only doctor. Any manufacturing concern today that had one-half this number of employees would try to have an emergency room where the employees could be looked after in case of illness, and the manufacturing concern would certainly have a doctor to look after them; that would be economy and efficiency. As stated here by Members of the House, many Members of Congress must have medical attention and have it here at their workshop. I have gone down to the doctor's office a number of times and had to get some medical attention, because of the fact that I happened to be on the floor of the House I did not have time to go uptown. I do not want to deny some Members of Congress certain medical attention. I feel every Member of Congress and all their clerks should receive emergency treatment when necessary. If I wanted to save money, I could take this next item for the Capitol Police, where we have 120 members on the police force.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. In a moment. I call attention to the fact that we have 120 Capitol Police here, and we were told by Members that a few of them did not know why they are here, that they are political appointees, and have little value as police. If I wanted to get rid of somebody, I would get rid of some police who do not know what it is all about, costing \$100,000 a year, instead of getting rid of a doctor who administers to the care of the membership and their clerks. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. I just want to ask the gentleman where he is going to get the money? This is a rather expensive operation, and I say to him as I said to my friend from Missouri, this does not abolish the position of House physician.

Mr. RICH. No; but if you go to the doctor and the doctor wants to give you a little liniment or a pill, he ought to be able to do it, instead of giving a prescription which you would have to go downtown 2 or 3 miles to get filled. I think that would be foolish.

Mr. RABAUT. Do we not furnish this same sort of service for other Government employees, and have we not provided doctors, nurses, and emergency rooms where there are large numbers of Government employees working?

Mr. RICH. If you want to strike out something, get rid of the hospitals they have got in some of the departments downtown, where they are doing absolutely unnecessary things in hospitalization and have many doctors and many nurses, where here we only have one doctor and several helpers.

Mr. RABAUT. That does not happen to come under our appropriation; but nevertheless I want it well said on the floor that we are doing no more for Members of Congress than they are doing for other Government personnel in the departments and which all large industrial concerns do for their employees.

Mr. RICH. You are not doing half as much for the Members of Congress as you are for the people in the departments. I do not want to do something for Members of Congress that they should do for themselves, but I believe this item is justifiable; if it were not, I would have disappeared it in committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word on this point because I think it is something on which the committee should take a stand. I think we should determine whether we are going to have a doctor or whether we are going to dispense with his services. If the House is going to provide a physician for emergencies, then I wonder if it is going to strike out that portion of the bill which provides a few instruments and medicine with which to work. If we agree to retain the amount, are we going to deny an emergency shot in the arm, or a couple of aspirin pills to a sick or ailing Member? I have had two aspirin pills in the 7 years that I have been here. I did not pay for them. I was as sick as a horse; it was a late evening session; we had been on the floor for over 9 or 10 hours, so I had to get some relief. I had a

prescription or two during my service, but I always paid for those. If some Member happened to get a pain under the apron, and the doctor analyzed it as an acute green-apple pain, I wonder whether the patient Member would have to send downtown for a little paregoric, or pay 3 cents for a squirt of the stuff. I think it is sheer bunk and nonsense to raise objection to the item, and to split hairs over a thing of this kind. The House physician is as necessary as any Member of the House, and he must have something to work with. Who would deny to the venerable Judge MANSFIELD, or to Ed TAYLOR, or to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], or any other Member of this House some emergency assistance, or a little medicine? Certainly, I would not. I am wondering how many Members will vote to eliminate a portion of this appropriation which will permit us to have an attending physician, but will make the rule so rigid as to prescribe the giving of a couple of aspirin pills? Frankly, if it is a question of paying a nickel or a dime for two aspirin pills, I am willing to pay it. I am willing to go along with the gentleman from California, but I think it is a mighty picayunish thing to bring up here when it is something that affects the very life of the membership. Think of it. Twenty-three Members of this House have passed away in the last year. Many of them needed emergency attention, and emergency medicine. There is certainly no reason why they should have had to pay for it, if the doctor found it necessary to give them a few pills, a shot, or whatever it was to alleviate their pain.

I am ready to vote on the question, Mr. Chairman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Library proper: For the Librarian, the Librarian Emeritus, Chief Assistant Librarian, and other personal services, including special and temporary services and extra special services of regular employees (not exceeding \$2,000) at rates to be fixed by the Librarian, \$1,255,120, of which sum \$8,820 shall be immediately available.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which is on the Clerk's desk, which amendment has the approval of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the minority members of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 33, at the end of line 4, after the word "available", insert: "Provided, That not to exceed \$10,000 of any money accruing from lapses under this appropriation may be transferred in such sums as the Librarian may designate to the appropriations for Copyright Office, union catalogs, distribution of card indexes, and Library buildings; but none of such transferred funds shall be utilized for the employment of additional personnel."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to treat all branches of the Library alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. RAYBURN having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8913) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment, and the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion by Mr. RABAUT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] addressed the Committee of the Whole. He desires permission to extend his remarks by including therein a letter and resolution from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] may have permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein certain letters and excerpts therein. He had to leave unexpectedly before the Committee rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a brief submitted on March 12, 1940, by Patrick McHugh, of Boston, secretary-treasurer of the Atlantic Fishermen's Union, comprising 3,500 members from New England and New York, at a public hearing on that date before the United States Commissioner of Customs in Washington, D. C., on the matter of a proposed rescinding of Treasury Decision No. 49,682 which had so redefined American fisheries as to permit a shore station.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a copy of a bill I introduced and a report from the Post Office Department thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I shall place in the RECORD a forthright editorial from the Providence Journal of March 12 concerning the visit to Providence on March 11 of Assistant Secretary of State, Henry F. Grady, where he addressed a combined luncheon meeting of service clubs.

The scolding attitude of Mr. Grady and others of the administrative family toward trade associations when they presume to attack the reciprocal treaties, has drawn a merited rebuke from the Journal.

This newspaper, I might say in passing, has taken a favorable position toward the reciprocal trade treaty program, but unlike Mr. Grady and others of his school, the Journal recognizes that there are two sides to this question and both have a right to be heard, especially those men who have money invested in factories and plants and those employees whose livelihood is likely to be affected by some of these reciprocal trade treaties. Incidentally, I wonder who finances Mr. Grady in his trips around the country attacking trade associations. Is it his own or the taxpayers'

money he is spending on these scolding sprees? [Applause.] The editorial follows:

#### MR. GRADY'S ERROR

Assistant Secretary of State Grady perhaps already regrets his observation in this city yesterday that "we are rather used to special pleadings and trade-association executives who seem to have little else to do but go around the country and talk about tariffs." If he doesn't, he should. For certainly it is the duty of trade associations to present their case when reciprocal-trade agreements are being formulated. New England associations have done just that. Our Rhode Island groups, directly affected, have spent time and money to collect and present facts and figures relating to these agreements. They would have been recreant to their plain duty had they neglected the task.

Instead of lecturing them for taking this active interest, Mr. Grady should have commended them. For no economic policy of the administration is more dependent on statistical truth for its justification than the reciprocal trade agreements program. Its very existence in the long run depends on commercial facts and figures that will sustain its basic principle. That is why Secretary Hull has marshalled so much data to support his pleadings. Such a program must of necessity stand constantly in the revealing light of factual information. Obviously, such truth cannot be drawn from thin air. It must come, steadily and completely, from both opponents and proponents.

The right of Rhode Island trade associations to present their case, whenever necessity arises, should not be challenged by Mr. Grady's unfortunate remark that "we are not going to yield to lobby pressure and organized campaigning." When the State Department thus reproaches industry for exercising a clear right, it is guilty of a narrow attitude that will in the end defeat its own purpose. We cannot help but feel that in making this thoughtless remark about trade associations, Mr. Grady yesterday injured the trade-agreements program in this State.

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the editorial to which I referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### INDIANA LIMESTONE

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, Indiana limestone is the best building stone in the world. You will find Hoosier stone in many of the most imposing structures in Washington and elsewhere in the country. It lends itself readily to architectural treatment and combines the qualities of permanence and beauty. Indiana limestone competes with other materials strictly on its merits and its Nation-wide use is evidence of its quality.

In the past 7 years the Indiana limestone industry has had a slump in large-scale construction. It is one of the hardest hit industries in the United States today. Many of our stone workers are out of jobs. Counties in the limestone belt have great numbers on the relief rolls. The farmers and businessmen are in distress in these communities. By using Indiana limestone our Government will benefit because of tremendous savings and a better product. I contend that more Indiana limestone should be used in the construction of Federal buildings.

I have read something about the use of marble and the glories of ancient Greece and Rome. While this makes nice reading, I believe that we are interested more in the solid prosperity of America. Furthermore, as building material, Indiana limestone will compare with the best, ancient or modern. It is already embodied in the construction of the following beautiful buildings in Washington: Archives, Departments of Justice, Labor, Internal Revenue, Commerce, Post Office, Apex, and the Carnegie and Brookings Institution Buildings.

The Indiana limestone buildings typify the progress and modern soundness of America as well as its glory. They certainly deserve careful consideration at this time when we need jobs for Americans, as well as glory, and can have both of them. [Applause.]

#### THE BATA SHOE CO.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a series of three articles written by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, which have appeared during the last 3 days in the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Do they exceed the limit of matter allowed by the Committee on Printing?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think not; they are comparatively short.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I brought to the attention of the House the effort of Mr. Jan Bata to attempt to bring in 100 persons from Europe as instructors which he claimed were necessary to operate the so-called Bata shoe plant at Belcamp, Md., and later that an attempt was made to bring in 500 more; 72 were admitted, but the Department of Labor found that 25 were all that were necessary to operate the plant, and the others, the Department of Labor ruled, were here illegally. Today I want to bring to the attention of the House 3 articles by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes in the Washington Daily News which describes the Belcamp shoeshop, how Mr. Bata plans to operate the plant, and describes the schools he is setting up for the children. His plan provides that the children shall go to school for a period of 3 years. Mr. Stokes says, in one of his articles:

The census questions about which so much clamor has been raised are simple compared with those put to youngsters who want to enlist for 3 years under agreement between parents and the company in the so-called industrial and business institute of the Bata Shoe Co.

Members of Congress objected bitterly to the questions that were proposed to be asked by the administration in the census leaflet, but these questions do not compare with those asked of the parents of the children, and of the children themselves, who go to the Bata school. It looks as if the administration were copying Mr. Bata's idea.

In reading the Stokes articles you will see that Mr. Bata has a feudal industrialism. His plan is thoroughly un-American. He aims to control his employees as an overlord his slaves. He is returning to methods that the people of this country discarded years and years ago. It is sending children into slavery. The children are worked in the daytime and sent to school at night. So for 24 hours a day they are under the complete control of Mr. Bata and his associates.

I want to read into the Record some of the questions that are asked by Mr. Bata and his lieutenants.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to compliment the gentleman for the fight she has made and her efforts to get these so-called skilled workers out of this country. I aided the gentleman as much as I could at the time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman has done a very great work in that respect.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman think she ought to also tell the House that while they go to work in the daytime and go to school at night they are going to be under the control of this man for 24 hours a day?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true. I shall read some of the questions that are asked the applicants. Quoting from the articles by Mr. Stokes:

The first subject on which the applicant is asked is what grade he received his last year in school and his conduct. Among other questions on education is, Were you pleased with your teachers?

Among a mass of questions on physical development are inquiries about drinking and smoking. Jan A. Bata, head of the company, is a prohibitionist.

Questions on mental character include inquiries as to whether the applicant considers himself calm, hot-tempered, carefree, over-

sensitive, whether he is nervous, whether he feels embarrassed when meeting new persons, whether he has any fears, what are his chief interests—nature, poetry, mystery, science, electricity, machines, cars, airplanes, radio, music, travel, animals, farming, religion, human beings—whether he has ever been before a juvenile judge.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member is interested in the camouflaged industrial method of this new monopolist in our midst. Quoting further from the articles of Mr. Stokes:

Questions on life include whether the applicant lives on a farm, in town, or city, who reared him, what were his living conditions, how he spends his leisure time, what kinds of books and magazines he reads, how, if he has been employed before, he spent his money.

Very detailed are the inquiries as to family, including whether parents are separated or divorced, whether they own any land or a home, whether they have any debts, the wages of father and of mother.

The applicant is warned that any intentionally false statement will bring discharge from the company when discovered.

Mind you, these answers are requested of mere boys and girls.

This is the method of autocracy, not democracy. This is industrial despotism, not industrial freedom. This is the method of dictatorship, not that of democratic leadership. Mr. Bata's method is the way of Stalin and Hitler. An excerpt from Mr. Bata's paper Belcamp is as follows:

A Bataman is the one whose family believes that work is the one thing that gives him a chance to fill life's void with something interesting and worth while.

Life is sweet to honest, striving, learning workmen, for their continual striving to better themselves makes them explore the world, which are then known to them alone.

Then it goes on to say:

We do not want men who work the required hours, take their pay, and go home, to come another day, or stay home if there is no work to do. No; we need men who stick to their work as if they were glued to it, men who make a game of their achievements.

We want real Yankees, who will not take a beating without straightening their backbones and saying, "Got licked, good, but wait to see tomorrow."

We want heroes.

There is a Hitler philosophy in the way these so-called schools in the Bata plant are conducted. It certainly should not be permitted.

May I say also that the families are asked to do certain things when they send these children to the factory school, or when Mr. Bata condescends to take the children into the factory school. The parents or the guardians of the students shall agree that the students shall:

- A. Work the weekly normal number of hours in the plant.
- B. Take class work not to exceed 10 periods of 50 minutes each.
- C. Learn aviation.

So far as I know, nothing has been done to teach the children aviation. That seems to be sort of a bait to draw them to the school. Quoting again from Mr. Stokes:

Then the parents or guardians shall agree furthermore that there shall be a 3-month trial period, at the end of which the final decision regarding the acceptance into the institute shall be reached. During the schooling period they shall not support their children or wards by any money or otherwise.

You can see the complete control that Mr. Bata has over these young persons who go into the school and his industrial plant. For 24 hours a day, as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] stated, Mr. Bata controls their lives and all the reading matter that Mr. Bata can distribute to them. You can see what a hero Mr. Bata is held up to be. The children are told to follow his example. They are also told that they are being trained to go to the farthestmost parts of the world; in other words, to spread the Bata system all over the world. This is another piece of juicy bait tendered to influence impressionable boys and girls into the Bata system.

Apparently the aim of Mr. Bata is to have a boot and shoe monopoly of the world. The Bata firm was organized to operate shoe factories in Holland, England, France, Netherlands Indies, English Indies, Canada, Switzerland, Egypt, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and other countries. It is one of the most monopolistic things I know anything about or ever heard about. It is a dangerous procedure in our industrial life and constitutes a menace to the workers in this country.

The parents or the guardians of the prospective students finally shall agree that they shall not interfere with the educational methods of the school, but that they shall cooperate with the teachers and tutors and shall morally support the work of the teaching staff.

You can see what a tremendous control Mr. Bata has, not only over the children but over the entire family. It is a very far reaching and a very dangerous influence that he exerts. It is obvious that after the disguise of Mr. Bata's so-called training-school scheme of his "Industrial and Business Institute" is explored and removed that all there is left is the ordinary commercial factory with an attempt to gain longer hours of employment than is permitted by the wage-hour law, and to dominate and mold the young lives of hitherto free American workers.

The following are three complete articles by Mr. Stokes:

[From the Washington Daily News of March 11, 1940]

#### DISPUTE IS SPREADING OVER BATA SHOE PLANT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

(Editor's note: A project for transplanting onto Maryland soil a famous foreign system of mass production has stirred up a controversy. Below, in the first of four dispatches, the background of the dispute is outlined.)

BALTIMORE, Md., March 11.—On a flat expanse of Maryland farm country at Belcamp, about 20 miles from this city, the Bata Shoe Co., founded and developed in former Czechoslovakia and now spread to many parts of the world, is building a self-contained industrial community in an attempt to gain a foothold for expansion of the Bata system in the United States.

This venture has become embroiled in controversies involving the Labor Department at Washington, its Immigration and Naturalization Bureau, and its Wage-Hour Division; also labor unions and shoe companies, which are protesting on the ground of competition and lowering of standards; and friends of labor, who are suspicious of paternalism.

These latter are skeptical particularly of the Bata work-and-school plan, under which boys and girls 16 to 18 years of age are signed up for 3 years of training, in agreements between company and parents, and live in company dormitories under close supervision.

#### MASSACHUSETTS OBJECTS

The fight over the project has spread to Congress. There its chief foe is Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS (R., Mass.), who bitterly attacked the Bata invasion on behalf of shoe workers in her State. She pointed out to the House that the Biggers unemployment census of 1937 showed approximately 34,000 idle boot-and-shoe workers in this country and 15,000 partly employed.

Chief political sponsor of the enterprise is Senator MILLARD F. TYDINGS (D., Md.), in whose home county of Harford the Bata Shoe Co. has located. The Senator's law partner, Robert H. Archer, is counsel for the company. The Senator has been active with the State and Labor Departments, since as far back as 1934, in clearing the way for establishment of the industrial community. Public announcement that it was to be set up in Maryland came only last April.

#### BUILDING ALREADY BEGUN

Already constructed are one factory building, a dormitory for the so-called Bata Industrial and Business Institute, a score of duplex houses for workers and families, and a home for the company's head, Jan A. Bata. A second factory building has been started.

Eventual plans of the company seem somewhat vague. A Labor Department group which inspected the project in November reported that 8 factory buildings altogether were planned. Frank J. Peiz, personnel manager, told the writer that 20 factory buildings were contemplated.

One report is that 10,000 persons eventually will be employed. Between 700 and 800 are working at Belcamp now.

Further developments in the company's relationship with the Government appear imminent.

Several months ago the Immigration Bureau's decision to permit the entry of 100 Czechoslovakian "instructors" to teach American workers the Bata methods of shoe manufacture was protested by both A. F. of L. and C. I. O. shoe workers' unions. The criticism forced an investigation at Belcamp by the Labor Department, which resulted in a scaling down of the original order to permit only 10 instructors, with subsequent revision to permit 15 other administrative and supervisory officials.

#### METHODS RESEMBLE UNITED STATES

It was discovered that methods of manufacture did not differ greatly from American methods. Senator TYDINGS was most active with State and Labor Department officials in putting through his original order for 100. He had been very active also, as demonstrated by numerous letters in the Labor Department files, in obtaining the admission of other Czechoslovakian workers from the home plant on one pretext or another and having their stays extended from time to time.

Mr. Bata, an aggressive fellow with a way of getting things done, is now threatening some sort of legal action against the Immigration Bureau, headed by James L. Houghteling, to force restoration of the original order.

The Wage-Hour Division has been brought into the picture by charges filed by Leo Goodman, of the United Shoe Workers, a C. I. O. affiliate, that the Bata company has violated the Wage-Hour Act at Belcamp. In a complaint filed in November he alleged that the company, in deducting for services furnished the employees, has failed to supply such services at cost for minimum-wage employees, as required by law.

#### WAGE-HOUR REPORT DUE

The investigation by the Wage-Hour Division is near completion and a report is expected soon.

This is not the first time the Bata company has drawn the attention of the Wage-Hour Division. A few months ago the division filed suit against the company in connection with 65 employees in its retail stores in the Chicago area—the company has some 47 retail stores in this country—and the company, in a stipulation last December 19, admitted the complaint and made restitution of \$7,000 in wages to the 65 employees.

In the reports made by the Labor Department officials who inspected the Belcamp project last November, it was explained that, while the company in its petition seeking admission of the 100 "instructors" had said that the best results could be obtained by employing young women and men locally and paying them comparatively high wages, actually the greater part of the new workers then were being paid the legal minimum of \$12.60 a week.

Mr. Goodman charged that even the minimum is not being paid according to law.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 12, 1940]

#### CHILDREN INDENTURED IN MARYLAND BATA PLANT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

(In the second of a series of articles about the Bata project for installing a European mass-production system in America, Mr. Stokes tells about the unusual school proposed for young workers.)

BALTIMORE, March 12.—The industrial colony being established at Belcamp, 20 miles from here, by the powerful and world-wide Bata Shoe Co., includes a remarkable training-school scheme for youngsters.

The so-called Bata Industrial and Business Institute, patterned after schools at the home plants in Czechoslovakia, is under the direction of Dr. Joseph Z. Schneider, past dean and full professor of the graduate school of commerce, Praha Institute of Technology, who was a visiting professor for a time at the University of Chicago.

Under the Bata system, as worked out here by Dr. Schneider, boys and girls between 16 and 18 are virtually indentured for 3 years to the company by agreement with their parents. They work at the plant during the day, go to school at night, live in dormitories, and are at all times under close supervision, which extends even to the disposition of their wages. Parental interference is prohibited.

#### UNDERGO TRIAL PERIOD

After a trial period of 3 months any student not found acceptable may be dismissed. Dr. Schneider said he expected to open the school in April with 50 or 60 students at the outset.

The school is an integral part of the Belcamp industrial colony, which represents an attempt by the Bata Co., crippled in former Czechoslovakia by the German occupation and control of its plants, to establish itself in the United States. For several years the company has maintained retail stores in this country, but this is its first American venture in production. Production is going forward at Belcamp in the one factory building already erected, where between 700 and 800 workers are employed. Most of the workers are high-school graduates from the surrounding agricultural region.

Seeking enlistments in the institute, Dr. Schneider has distributed a prospectus labeled "Bata key to success," along with questionnaires for prospective students to fill out. These consist of four and a half printed pages with far more detailed and intimate inquiries than those in the census which have caused criticism. Graduates in the 1938, 1937, and 1936 classes of Aberdeen High School, 4 miles away, received the prospectus.

#### WHAT IS DEMANDED

An excerpt from the prospectus illuminates the nature of the institute:

"The parents or the guardians of the student shall agree that the student shall—

"a. Work the normal weekly number of hours in the plant.

"b. Take classwork not to exceed 10 periods of 50 minutes each week.

"c. Learn aviation.



The parents or guardians shall agree furthermore that:

a. There shall be a 3-month trial period, at the end of which the final decision regarding the acceptance into the institute shall be reached.

b. During the schooling period they shall not support their children or wards by any money or otherwise.

c. They shall leave all the wages earned by their children or wards to be used by them under the guidance and supervision of the tutors, unless permitted otherwise by the director of the institute.

"The parents or the guardians finally shall agree that they shall not interfere with the educational methods of the school but that they shall cooperate with the teachers and tutors and shall morally support the work of the teaching staff.

"The parents or guardians also understand that their children or wards are being trained for positions not only in the United States of America but also in various foreign countries and shall therefore not interfere when their children or wards shall be transferred for duty and for further training to remote parts of the world."

The practical schooling of the students, according to the prospectus, "cover the whole manufacture of leather and rubber footwear," as well as theoretical instructions in office and administrative work, raw materials, technological processes and finished products, economics, management, salesmanship, mathematics, commercial geography, English and two other languages, foot anatomy, hygiene, and pathology."

Dr. Schneider said nothing would be produced for sale in the school. The students, he explained, will receive the minimum wage under the Wage-Hour Act, \$12.60 a week, minus a 13-cent deduction for social security. They will have little coming back to them after various other deductions.

He estimated room rent at a dollar a week, board at \$6 weekly, with \$3 for tuition, recreation, etc., leaving the student \$2.47. Students will be encouraged to save. In the schools in Czechoslovakia students were required to save and were paid 10 percent interest.

The objective is for the student to become, among other things, "cooperatively minded" and "well disciplined."

Aviation instruction in a shoe factory seems somewhat unusual.

Asked if this was just a "come-on" to enlist youngsters, Dr. Schneider said this was not true, and that aviation instruction would be given later when a field is developed and planes are purchased.

Jan A. Bata, head of the company, is an aviation enthusiast, it seems. On this point the prospectus says:

"Aviation is an integral part of the Bata education. Two years ago Dr. Bata flew around the world for business reasons in his Lockheed. Only two out of the seven people participating in this first commercial flight around the world were not pilots. Any one of the remaining five might have brought the airplane to safe landing in case of an emergency."

[From the Washington Daily News of March 13, 1940]

BATA PLANT DEMANDS "STUDENTS" BARE ALL

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the third of five dispatches)

BALTIMORE, Md., March 13.—The census questions about which so much clamor has been raised are simple compared with those put to youngsters who want to enlist for 3 years, under agreements between parents and company, in the "Industrial and Business Institute" of the Bata Shoe Co. at Belcamp, Md.

The inquiry into the private lives of prospective "students" and their families is but a foretaste of the close supervision maintained by the Bata system upon its workers, as demonstrated at the home plants of the corporation at Zlin, in what used to be Czechoslovakia.

Labor is aroused over the proposed establishment of such a system in the United States and looks askance at the "institute," to which boys and girls from 16 to 18 are to be admitted for a regimented sort of existence. They will work during the day, go to school at night, live in a company dormitory, and all under supervision which extends to disposition of their wages—the \$12.60 minimum fixed by the Wage-Hour Act—most of which the company will get back to pay for room, board, tuition, athletic fees, and the like.

CHARGE LAW VIOLATION

Charges by the United Shoe Workers that the company has already violated the Wage-Hour Act are under investigation by the Wage-Hour Division, with a report expected soon.

The questionnaire sent to prospective student-workers in the "institute" covers six printed pages and gives a clue to the type of mind desired by the company. Dr. Joseph Z. Schneider, institute director, said he planned to begin operations next month with 50 or 60 students at the start.

The first subject on which the applicant is asked what grade he received his last year in school is "conduct." Among other questions on education is, "Were you pleased with your teachers?"

QUESTIONED ON DRINKING

Among a mass of questions on physical development are inquiries about drinking and smoking. Jan A. Bata, head of the company, is a prohibitionist.

Questions on "mental character" include inquiries as to whether the applicant considers himself calm, hot-tempered, carefree, oversensitive, whether he is nervous, whether he feels embarrassed when meeting new persons, whether he has any fears, what are his chief interests—nature, poetry, mystery, science, electricity, machines, cars, airplanes, radio, music, travel, animals, farming, religion, human beings—whether he has ever been before a juvenile judge.

Questions on life include whether the applicant lives on a farm, in town or city, who reared him, what were his living conditions, how he spends his leisure time, what kinds of books and magazines he reads, how, if he has been employed before, he spent his money.

MUST BARE HOME LIFE

Very detailed are the inquiries as to family, including whether parents are separated or divorced, whether they own any land or a home, whether they have any debts, the wages of father and of mother.

The applicant is warned that any "intentionally false statement" will bring discharge from the company when discovered.

Between 700 and 800 workers are now employed at the one factory—one of several projected—which has been completed. The Americans among them are mostly young unskilled workers, many of them high-school graduates, drawn from the farm community in which the company has located.

They are continually subjected, in the weekly newspaper run by the company, to what might be termed "company talk," including praise of its founder and his managers, success stories, continuous injunctions about the value of hard work.

Of the general manager the paper Belcamp said recently in a lengthy article:

"The favorite pastime of a village lad called John Hoza, who even in early youth was a leader, was to play an industrialist. Around 1900, while the other boys played 'cops and robbers,' the Zlin boys' gang, composed of many of the present executives of the Bata organization all over the world, spent every minute of its free time in building and running their imaginary factories.

"They planned the size, decided on the number of chimneys, and types of machinery, assigning the various positions to the members of the gang and deciding on the hiring and firing of the other imaginary employees."

The front page of the paper recently carried a long statement by Mr. Bata, of which some excerpts are:

"A Bata man is one who firmly believes that work is the one thing that gives him a chance to fill life's void with something interesting and worth while.

"LIFE IS SWEET

"Life is sweet to honest, striving, learning, working men, for their continual striving to better themselves makes them explore new worlds, which are then known to them alone.

"We do not want men who work the required hours, take their pay and go home, to come another day, or stay home if there is no work to do. No; we need men who stick to their work as if they were glued to it, men who make a game of their achievements.

"We want real Yankees, who will not take a beating without straightening their backbones and saying, 'Got licked good, but wait to see tomorrow.'

"We want heroes!"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a tax report by the District and also a letter from Commissioner Long, of Massachusetts, regarding the intangible tax.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Thursday, March 14, 1940:

H. R. 5476, to create the Alaska Fisheries Commission, and for other purposes.

H. R. 6690, making further provision for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7542, to amend section 6 of an act of Congress entitled "An act for the protection of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1924.

H. R. 7987, to amend section 1 of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relative to the fisheries of Alaska.

H. R. 7988, making provisions for employment of the residents of Alaska in the fisheries of said Territory, and for other purposes.

H. R. 8115, making provision for employment of residents of Alaska only in the salmon fishery of the Britol Bay area, Alaska, during the year 1940.

H. R. 8172, to amend section 5 of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1906, relative to the Alaska salmon fishery. Tuesday, March 19, 1940:

H. R. 6136, to amend the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1353; 34 U. S. C. 1122), so as to authorize an appropriation of \$50,000 annually to aid in the maintenance and support of marine schools.

H. R. 7094, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to construct or acquire vessels to be furnished the States of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and California for the benefit of their respective nautical schools, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7870, to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, to include Astoria, Oreg.

H. R. 8612, to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to construct or acquire vessels to be furnished the States of New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and California for the benefit of their respective nautical schools, and for other purposes.

Thursday, March 21, 1940:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Thursday, March 21, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bills providing for the establishment of marine hospitals: H. R. 2985 (GREEN), at Jacksonville, Fla.; H. R. 3214 (GEYER of California), at Los Angeles, Calif.; H. R. 3578 (CANNON of Florida), at Miami, Fla.; H. R. 3700 (PETERSON of Florida), State of Florida; H. R. 4427 (GREEN), State of Florida; H. R. 5577 (IZAC), at San Diego, Calif.; H. R. 6983 (WELCH), State of California.

Wednesday, March 27, 1940:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Wednesday, March 27, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bills providing for Government aid to the lumber industry: H. R. 7463 (ANGELL) and H. R. 7505 (BOYKIN).

Tuesday, April 9, 1940:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on Tuesday, April 9, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bill: H. R. 7637, relative to liability of vessels in collision.

#### COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents, House of Representatives, will hold hearings Thursday, March 14, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 8445, to protect the United States in patent-infringement suits. H. R. 8445 is a substitute for H. R. 6877.

The Committee on Patents will hold hearings Thursday, March 21, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., on S. 2689, to amend section 33 of the Copyright Act of March 4, 1909, relating to unlawful importation of copyrighted works.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, March 15, 1940, for the consideration of H. R. 7615 and H. R. 8511.

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, March 18, 1940, for the consideration of H. R. 6939 and H. R. 7633, the identical titles of both bills being "Prescribing tolls to be paid for the use of locks on all rivers of the United States."

#### COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs on Tuesday, March 19, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 8239, "Creating the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, and for other purposes."

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1453. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report on companies issuing face amount installment certificates, which supplements the Commission's over-all report on its study of investment trusts and investment companies, made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 659); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1454. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 27, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on reexamination of the Intracoastal Waterway from Beaufort, N. C., to the Cape Fear River, with a view to determining whether any modification of the existing project should be made at this time, particularly with reference to the protection of the seafood resources in Myrtle Sound, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted March 6, 1939, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted March 14, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 660); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1455. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 27, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on reexamination of Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 4, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 661); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1456. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 27, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Burwells Bay, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1457. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 27, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Water Hyacinth Obstructions, Florida, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 13, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1458. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 27, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of waterway from St. Johns River to Lake Beresford, Fla., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 28, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1459. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 27, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of west fork of the Tombigbee River, Miss., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted January 24, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1460. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 27, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of waterway between Cambridge Creek and Fishing Bay via Little Blackwater River, Md., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 28, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1461. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain personnel or former



personnel of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps for the value of personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on October 27, 1938," approved June 19, 1939; to the Committee on Claims.

1462. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement in duplicate of costs, cancellations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects compiled as of June 30, 1939; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8913. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of Maryland: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2977. An act authorizing the construction and maintenance of a dike or dam across Stansbury Creek in Baltimore County, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1765). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATRICK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3209. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pearl River at or near Carthage, in the State of Mississippi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1766). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7406. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the general State authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1767). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7407. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the general State authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Millersburg, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1768). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7655. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River between the village of Barryville, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1769). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7989. A bill to legalize a bridge across the Nestucca River at Pacific City, Oreg.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1770). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8320. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1771). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8372. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1772). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALLECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8467. A bill authorizing The Superior Oil Co., a California corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge or causeway across the old channel of the Wabash River from Cut-Off Island, Posey

County, Ind., to White County, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. 1773). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8669. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1774). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 461. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1778). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7833. A bill to set aside certain lands for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 7981. A bill to grant pensions to certain unmarried dependent widows of Civil War veterans who were married to the veteran subsequent to June 26, 1905; without amendment (Rept. No. 1780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on Mines and Mining. H. R. 8285. A bill with reference to certain mining practices and defining unfair-trade practices in certain instances; with amendment (Rept. No. 1781). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 334. Joint resolution to approve the action of the Secretary of the Interior in deferring the collection of certain irrigation charges against lands under the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, without amendment (Rept. No. 1782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2433. An act for the relief of Frank Casey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6823. A bill for the relief of Wilson A. Kramer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri: Committee on Military Affairs. House Joint Resolution 275. Joint resolution to authorize the President to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Frank W. Seifert; with amendment (Rept. No. 1777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 8914. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to accept, as loans, from States, and political subdivisions thereof, funds to be immediately used in the prosecution of authorized flood-control work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 8915. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital and home of domiciliary care in central California; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 8916. A bill to reimpose the trust on certain lands allotted to Indians of the Crow Tribe, Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 8917. A bill to authorize the construction of a waiting room and comfort station in Commodore Barney Circle, United States Reservation 55-56, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 8918. A bill to allow certain credits against the income of individuals for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 8919. A bill to authorize the setting aside of an area within the Canal Zone to preserve and conserve its natural features for scientific study, for providing and maintaining facilities for such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8920. A bill adding section 41-A to the judicial code concerning the importation, transportation, and disposition of property acquired through confiscatory decrees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H. R. 8921. A bill providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 8922. A bill relating to lands of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 488. Joint resolution to provide for a committee to investigate possibilities of liquid oxygen-carbon explosives for military purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces to indicate the interest of the Government of the United States in the ideals and purposes of the Golden Gate International Exposition to be continued in 1940 and to authorize the issue of such coins to the San Francisco Bay Exposition sponsoring said international exposition and the sale thereof by the San Francisco Bay Exposition at par or at a premium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution providing for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, and for participation in the meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and the commissions established by that Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 8923. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sadie Stepp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLEOD:

H. R. 8924. A bill for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 8925. A bill for the relief of Anna and Fred Aebi; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 8926. A bill for the relief of F. J. Rozier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8927. A bill authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Comdr. Joseph A. Gainard, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 8928. A bill for the relief of Walter Weston Pierce; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 8929. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Klink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6922. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Niagara County, N. Y., protesting against enactment of St. Lawrence seaway and power treaty, and urging favorable consideration of House Resolution 360 and House Concurrent Resolution 48; to the Committee on Rules.

6923. Also, resolution adopted by the Niagara Falls (N. Y.) Post, No. 54, of Veterans of Foreign Wars, protesting against personal questions on census questionnaire and urging their elimination; to the Committee on the Census.

6924. Also, resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New York, urging amendment of legislation so that questionnaire of Federal census may be changed to eliminate personal questions; to the Committee on the Census.

6925. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of sundry citizens of Kenosha, Wis., protesting against the present census-taking laws; to the Committee on the Census.

6926. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis., supporting the Federal chain-store-tax bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6927. Also, petition of the United Furniture Workers of America, Local No. 799, Kenosha, Wis., protesting against the proposed amendments to the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Labor.

6928. By Mr. BYRNE of New York: Petition of the Albany County Board of Supervisors, Albany, N. Y., memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose the adoption of a treaty for the improvement of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6929. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, urging repeal of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

6930. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring enactment of the Logan-Walter bills (S. 915 and H. R. 6324); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6931. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Boston, Mass., opposing any effort made that will affect the operation of two large sugar refineries in Boston; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6932. Also, petition of the National Association of Western Electric Employees, Boston, Mass., opposing amendments to the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Labor.

6933. By Mr. HARRINGTON: Petition of the Western Iowa National Farm Loan Association of Sioux City, Iowa; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6934. Also, petition of the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Departments; to the Committee on Roads.

6935. Also, petition of the Remsen National Farm Loan Association of Remsen, Iowa; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6936. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the National Association of State Savings, Building and Loan Supervisors, concerning House bill 6971; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6937. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, Local No. 18, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Sweeney bill (H. R. 4098), to make the United States Government-owned motor vehicle service a permanent branch of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6938. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers International Union, Local No. 46, New York City, favoring the passage of the Steagall bill, known as Senate bill 591; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6939. Also, petition of the Central Civic Association of Hollis, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Barry



bill (H. R. 7636) for a 2-cent postage for Queens County, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6940. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Bronx County Bakers' Board of Trade, urging opposition to Senate bill 2395, known as the wheat-allotment bill, as adoption of same would result in a bread tax with a resultant raise in the cost of bread; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6941. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to amend the Federal Census Act so that the personal questions may be eliminated from the questionnaire and the criminal penalty abolished; to the Committee on the Census.

6942. Also, petition of the National Concrete Masonry Association, urging that the House of Representatives give speedy and favorable consideration to amendments to the Housing Act as embodied in Senate bill 591, thereby relieving unemployment, stimulating industries, encouraging construction, and employing capital; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6943. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Central Civic Association of Hollis, N. Y., petitioning the Congress of the United States to eliminate discrimination so long endured by the people of the county of Queens, N. Y., and impels the enactment into law of the bill known as H. R. 7636; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6944. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the Mercer County Association of Retail Grocers, Bluefield, W. Va., urging that the sugar refining industry in the United States be amply protected by Congress in 1940 and thereafter against any further loss of business to the highly subsidized tropical refiners or by the beet-sugar industry, or both; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6945. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Ladies Auxiliary, No. 5, of the I. W. A., Ryderwood, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antidemocratic and un-American activities and the antialien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6946. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to antialien bills; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6947. Also, petition of the Seattle, Wash., Building Trades Council, Seattle, King County, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the United States Housing Authority program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, March 4, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God who art from everlasting to everlasting and with whom is no variableness, neither shadow that is cast by turning: We thank Thee for every good and perfect gift that cometh down from the Father of Lights, and especially for the kingdom that cannot be shaken, for the righteousness that endureth forever. Help us to realize that deep in the heart of the universe, among the imperishable treasures of life which time cannot alter, is the great joy of finding and recovering that which has been lost. Grant in this Passiontide, as we draw nearer and nearer to the Cross in contemplation, that we may find the joy in rediscovering the considerate and kindly things that overflow only from the Saviour's heart into our world's best thought and sentiment, to the upbuilding of our character and the better understanding of our fellow men. We ask it in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 13, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8913) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## LAWS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 2 (a) (11) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I transmit copies of laws enacted by the National Assembly of the Philippine Islands. Included are laws of the First National Assembly, third session, January 24, 1938, to May 19, 1938; and of the Second National Assembly, first session, January 23, 1939, to May 18, 1939; first special session, August 15, 1939, to September 18, 1939; and second special session, September 25, 1939, to September 29, 1939.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 14, 1940.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Townsend Club No. 1, of Clinton, Iowa, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 3255) to provide for national recovery by raising revenue and retiring citizens past 60 years of age from gainful employment and provide for the general welfare of all the people of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 7447, authorizing the Secretary of War to make a survey of the proposed T tunnel as a means of communication and transportation between San Pedro, Wilmington, Terminal Island, and Long Beach, Calif., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of New York, remonstrating against the United States entering into foreign entanglements or participating in foreign wars, and praying that the armed forces of the Nation only protect America against invasion, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TYDINGS presented the petition of members of Local Union No. 12 of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, Cumberland, Md., praying for the imposition of higher tariff duties than those now existing on glassware, and also that the control of all tariff legislation be retained in the Congress, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOLT presented petitions of members of Local Union No. 539, of Wellsburg, and Local Union No. 557, of Morgantown, both of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America in the State of West Virginia, praying for the imposition of higher tariff duties than those now existing on glassware, and also that the control of all tariff legislation be retained in the Congress, which were ordered to lie on the table.